

FEB 25 1965

3474 Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500320026-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

February 25

**THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record certain editorials and communications which I have received expressing opposition to a continuation of the U.S. undeclared war in Asia.

There being no objection, the editorials and communications were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Daily Courier, Grants Pass, Oreg.]
SOLDIER SEES VIETNAM WAR AS FOOLISH,
USELESS

We read, each day, about what is going on in Vietnam, periodically, we are given some correspondent's version of just what it is all about.

But what are the actual observations of the country, its people, and the fighting that go on in the heads of our servicemen stationed there? Only they can say.

We have been allowed to peek into one of these soldiers' minds via a letter he wrote to local kin and the view is rather startling. It also is eloquent and enlightening.

The writer is a captain in the U.S. Army, is a medical doctor, and is assigned to one of our advisory teams in South Vietnam. What he writes is this, in part:

"You asked about the advisory team. As far as I know, this is unclassified information. Incidentally, from occasional information which we get from our enemy, the Vietcong, they know each of us, our arrival dates, our ranks, serial numbers, and our jobs, so advisers are not too secret.

"Well, America was more or less 'invited' to help in this war many years ago and we are, therefore, 'guests' of the country.

"We supposedly do not actually fight the war, so it is a trifle different than your Korea. Someone said the other day, however, that, 'yes, we are advisers in the war. We drop several thousands of pounds of 'advice' every day.'

"There are advisers for everything: cooks, artillery, infantry, commandos, doctors—everything except beggars, but they seem to make out fairly well anyway.

"My particular role is somewhat nebulous, I'm afraid, but it deals with helping Vietnamese Army doctors take care of civilians in their particular areas. I work in two different Provinces which lie directly north and directly south of Saigon. There are about 3 million people in the two states and about six fully trained doctors, so we have plenty to do usually. I am the leader of three grizzled sergeants, and we just travel around training Vietnamese Army medics in the treatment of the civilian population.

"We call it 'The Traveling Medicine Show' and the amount of actual good which we do is questionable. But you know the Army—'It is not for us to question why' * * *.

"Saigon is a fantastic city. It is oriental enough to be full of intrigue and danger, and French enough to be beautiful and exciting. The city sprawls out like a big woman curled along the Saigon River. Saigon is the heart, the pride and the joy of all South Vietnam. She is the biggest center of industry, culture and population of the entire nation. I am afraid that I love her.

"But the people are the real reason for my existence. They are a beautiful, curious, industrious and active group. They are not as artistic or original as their Chinese ancestors, nor are they as aggressive as their Japanese neighbors. They are small, affectionate, beautiful, simple (superficially) and mystic. They have never really known peace, and their attitude in war is one of complacency and patience, almost indifference.

"They are good people. They have fed me when I was hungry, given me their mats when I was tired and given me their friendship and trust when I was a stranger. Someday I hope that I can return something to them.

"For it is a fabulous country, this Vietnam. High rugged mountains with their tops poked through the mist clouds, rushing white water and deep mountain pools, a beach of white-tan sand which stretches for 1,200 miles, islands that would give Hawaii jealousy, a jungle with all the color and danger and life of Africa, all superimposed upon a culture as old and as deep as the earth itself.

"War, of course, ruins it all, and I really believe that that is what the man who said 'war is hell' actually meant. Someday I shall tell you about the war, when we can talk for hours.

"The chief points are:

"(a) This is a war, despite what newspapers may call it, and (b) war is useless, pointless, and ridiculous.

"At first it was (and I hate to admit it) exciting: getting shot at, always worried about mines on the roads or mortars at night, and the sounds of artillery at night (it is a wonderful sound, you know), but then after a while, the foolishness and waste of it just gets downright tiresome.

"Useless, ridiculous, pointless, foolish, wasteful, tiresome. That's what wars are to the men who fight them. But so long as tyranny and jealousy and greed exist between nations, I imagine we can expect more useless, ridiculous, pointless, foolish, wasteful and tiresome wars, and more men will fight, and die, and learn the truth about the whole process."—ILLE.

[From the Toronto Globe and Mail]

SEEKING A WAY TO SETTLE AN EXPANDING WAR

Prime Minister Lester Pearson proposed no solutions to the Vietnam dilemma in his speech this week, and he is undoubtedly right to insist, at this critical stage, that any specific views the Canadian Government has should be expressed privately in Washington. The United States carries a heavy and dangerous burden in Vietnam, and this is no time for friendly governments that do not share that burden to go fault-finding in public.

From Mr. Pearson's analysis of the problem, however, it is fairly plain that the Government sees a negotiated settlement leading to the withdrawal of all foreign forces, as the only way to peace and stability in southeast Asia.

Mr. Pearson sees no hope of mastering the Vietcong guerrilla forces in a continuing war confined to South Vietnam and only a faint hope that air attacks on North Vietnam might bring the Communist leadership to the conference table; in fact, such an enlargement of the war could well succeed in producing a major Far Eastern war between the United States and Communist China.

The Prime Minister endorses the appeal this week by the Government of India for "an immediate suspension of all provocative action in South Vietnam as well as North Vietnam by all sides," and an international conference to settle the future of the area.

This is substantially the way out urged repeatedly by President Charles de Gaulle of France. In the French view, no amount of force would be sufficient to defeat the Vietcong.

Mr. Pearson also drew attention to the essential weakness of the United States position in South Vietnam, in that the "free" Vietnamese Government it is supposed to be helping has no basis of popular support in the country.

Ideally, he said, there should be "a unified, independent, neutral Vietnam," ending both foreign intervention and the partition imposed by the 1954 Geneva agreement. But how to prevent a unified Vietnam from turning inevitably Communist under Chinese pressure?

The answer to Mr. Pearson's question is probably that no stable Vietnamese Government, North, South, or unified, can now be formed without Vietcong participation, if not dominance. The one realistic hope is, by international guarantees emerging from a new conference, to prevent southeast Asia from falling under the dominion of the Chinese Government.

In the present climate of American opinion, this is a difficult outlook for the U.S. Government to accept. A still greater obstacle to negotiation over southeast Asia is the fact that any conference would have to

include Communist China as one of the principally interested powers.

Under President Lyndon Johnson, U.S. policy shows no signs of abandoning its refusal to recognize the existence of China. The 1954 Geneva conference could be held without direct U.S. participation, because France was the Western Power mainly involved. This time it is the U.S. responsibility, and Washington's stubborn refusal to deal with Peiping is one of the major reasons why war continues and threatens to expand in south-east Asia, Korea, the Formosa Straits, and now Vietnam; crisis after crisis, and still the United States will not face the realities of power in the Far East. Mr. Johnson has rejected out of hand the international appeal for a new Geneva-style conference.

Yet, as the events of this week have shown, the only likely alternative to negotiation is escalating warfare. The Chinese-American war Mr. Pearson warned of is only part way up the escalator; at the top is a world holocaust. The whole world therefore is vitally concerned with the immediate future in Vietnam, and the world has a right to demand more from U.S. leadership than the present static policy of retaliation or "deterrent" reactions to Vietcong attacks.

The air strikes on North Vietnam bases may be justified as an interim measure to stave off complete defeat for the United States-sponsored South Vietnam Government. But only if there is also a real effort to find a formula for peace.

[From the New York Times]

THE DANGERS IN VIETNAM

The Vietnamese situation has entered a new stage. The war will not be the same since the Vietcong attack on Pleiku and the reprisals against North Vietnam which continued yesterday. It seems axiomatic of this type of warfare that it either escalates or it stops. For the present, it is escalating and becoming more expensive in lives and more perilous every day.

Pleiku has once again proved, as Secretary McNamara said, that the American forces cannot protect themselves against this type of "sneak attack." Its sequel served notice on Hanoi—and indirectly on Peiping and Moscow—that the United States will retaliate when Americans are attacked. The whole affair indicates forcibly that the long-recognized dynamism of the Vietnamese conflict has risen to a dangerous level.

Secretary McNamara says that the situation has not reached a crisis; but it has done so in the sense that the United States is becoming less and less able to restrict the conflict to minor proportions. The possible choices of action or inaction are being steadily whittled down. The United States is gradually approaching a point where it either goes on to a major engagement involving North Vietnam and Communist China, or it actively seeks a diplomatic solution, which amounts to a disengagement on reasonable and honorable terms.

President Johnson has in the past denied that the United States has any intention of carrying the war to North Vietnam. Yet he considered it necessary in the past few days to help the South Vietnamese raid North Vietnam twice. Since it is not to be expected that the Vietcong in South Vietnam will cease their attacks on their tactics, and since Peiping and Moscow are committed to help Hanoi, the dangers of the future are only too obvious.

The Americans working on the Vietnamese problem in Washington and Saigon must often feel as if the problems have a nightmarish or fourth dimensional quality. Western ideas, modes of thought and methods do not function as it seems that they logically should. Mortars and bombs do speak a universal language; but they may ultimately lead to the unthinkable conclusions of a nuclear war.

The only sane way out is diplomatic, international, political, economic—not military. A solution will not be found by exchanging harder and harder blows. Surrender is out of the question and "victory" for either side is impossible.

Perhaps a new start can be made from an untried base—that Americans, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russians are all sensible human beings who are ready for peace in southeast Asia, or at least willing to consider it. There would be prices to pay, but there would be gains as well as losses. Diplomacy is surely not yet a lost art or a dead language.

[From the New York Times]

BLACK DAY IN VIETNAM

The slugfest in Vietnam continues; the war escalates; the danger grows; the goal of peace recedes. Just in 1 day—yesterday—many Americans were killed when an enlisted men's barracks was blown up by Vietcong terrorists, while in the north, in a pitched battle that began on Monday, Vietcong guerrillas wiped out five companies of South Vietnamese troops. Everybody concerned is braced for Washington's response, in accordance with the new policy of reprisals.

There is a frightening "normality" about the situation. Events are occurring with the inexorability of a Greek tragedy. President de Gaulle, who yesterday returned to his suggestion of another Geneva Conference and a negotiated settlement, was right in saying that the war cannot be won no matter how much air and naval power the United States commits or what reprisals China may take. It cannot be won by any outsider, American or Chinese.

Washington evidently hopes that if North Vietnam is threatened enough or punished enough it will agree to a truce, Korean style; and then the United States will be in a position to negotiate peace or a controlled neutralization from a position of strength. The greatest weakness of this reprisal policy against North Vietnam is that while it is true the Vietcong gets orders, advice, some arms and some men from North Vietnam, the war is being fought in South Vietnam. That is where American lives were lost yesterday and where American-trained and armed Vietnamese soldiers were defeated.

The Vietcong live and operate in South Vietnam, using American arms captured from the Vietnamese. The peasants either help them, or accept them, or are cowed into submission by them. The guerrillas, as Vietminh against the French a few years ago, or as Vietcong today, have been fighting for two decades. They are tough, dedicated, fanatical, well trained. Perhaps they are not winning, but certainly they are not losing. Meanwhile, each day that passes gives further evidence of the relentless escalation of the conflict.

This is what gives special point to President de Gaulle's renewed suggestion to recall the 14-nation Geneva Conference to seek an "international accord excluding all foreign intervention" in southeast Asia. The key factor in the De Gaulle proposal—and the main stumbling block for the United States—is that no conference and no settlement is possible in that region without the participation of Communist China. Whether we like it or not—and we do not like it—Communist China is an interested party; and the United States knows of course that North Vietnam cannot be bombed as if Communist China did not exist.

There may still be a choice: talk or fight. If everybody waits too long, the chance to talk will be gone.

[From the New York Times]

GREATNESS BY RESTRAINT

Escalation of the war in Vietnam, such as took place last week, has led the United

States to the entrance of a one-way street. If followed to the bitter end, this road could lead to a major war involving Communist China and probably the Soviet Union. But there's still time to stop.

A great power can demonstrate its greatness by its restraint. The United States has the air and naval power to destroy everything of importance in North Vietnam; but this country would show itself to be far wiser and far stronger by refraining from doing so than by pursuing a policy of repetitive retaliation, which is at once so seductive and so dangerous. Despite the administration's oft-repeated desire "to avoid spreading the conflict," this present policy of reprisals is inexorably carrying the United States into a major armed struggle in southeast Asia—unless a halt is called, and soon.

When President Johnson ordered last Sunday's retaliatory strike after the Vietcong attack on Pleiku, there was understanding and support for his action. Yet, it was recognized that the two actions—the assault on a U.S. military installation in South Vietnam and the American decision to respond by striking at staging areas in North Vietnam—vastly increased the peril to world peace that have always been inherent in the Vietnamese conflict.

Now each side feels obliged to match a show of power by the other with an even greater response—a course that can only invite holocaust. For the United States the problem is made severer by the impossibility of striking effectively at the Vietcong without carrying the war into North Vietnam and thus intensifying the pressure on Peking and Moscow to become actively involved.

President Johnson is up against his greatest foreign policy test. Surely he knows that the complex problems of Vietnam and southeast Asia cannot be settled by arms alone. An infinity of social, political, economic, religious, tribal, nationalistic, historic and traditional factors are at work in Vietnam. The country can best demonstrate its wisdom and responsibility by keeping its powder dry and meanwhile trying patience, diplomacy and negotiation.

History, good intentions and a concatenation of events have led the United States into a morass where we sink deeper each day. The Vietnamese conflict should not be almost exclusively a U.S. burden. The Russians have good reasons to want peace in Vietnam. The French want to bring about an international conference. So does United Nations Secretary General Thant. The Chinese would probably refuse to attend one or even to compromise; but nobody will know unless a conference is tried.

What the United States is now doing in Vietnam is playing directly into the hands of Communist China by taking actions that—however defensive in intent—lead to a steadily escalating, and hence more dangerous, conflict. This, surely, is the last thing in the world that the Johnson administration and the American people want. Therefore something else should be tried, and this something has to be negotiation with all parties concerned.

The United States has made its point very forcefully with bombs during the last week. Its power is indisputable. In the light of the strength this country has shown, it can now offer to continue the argument over a conference table where its power will be undiminished. But the outcome might then be peace instead of war.

[From the New York Times]

THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM

If the United States has a policy in South Vietnam, its outlines do not emerge with any clarity from the statement President Johnson appended to his speech before the National Industrial Conference Board yesterday.

The President reiterates that this coun-

try wants no wider war, yet his statement surrenders all initiative to the Vietcong and their external allies. "Our continuing actions will be those that are justified and made necessary by the continuing aggression of others," Mr. Johnson says. He stresses that the United States seeks no conquest and that its sole aim is to "join in the defense and protection of the freedom of a brave people."

All this is admirable as a reaffirmation of the consistent American position on the Vietnamese conflict, but it provides no answer to two factors that have emerged with overwhelming force in recent weeks. One is that the South Vietnamese, ruled by a succession of fragile governments under the domination of bickering warlords, are showing little appetite for doing any fighting in their own defense or even for helping to guard our troops against sneak attack. The second is that the nature of the Vietcong guerrilla tactics makes it almost impossible to hit back at the Communist forces without carrying the attack into North Vietnam and thus creating the wider war the President wants to avoid.

Each northward strike enlarges the peril of active intervention by Communist China and increases the pressure on Soviet Russia to abandon the withdrawn position it so plainly prefers. What is still lacking in the President's formulation is any hint of the circumstances under which a negotiated settlement, of the type proposed by Secretary General Thant of the United Nations, might be approached. Without such a move, the potentiality of a vastly expanded war increases each day.

[From the New York Times]

THE WAR HAWKS

A comparatively small group of Americans, at this moment predominantly political in character and predominantly Republican in politics, is doing its best to multiply the perils and frustrations of the war in southeast Asia.

This group ignores the realities of the present situation. It ignores the obvious weariness of the people of South Vietnam. It ignores the steady stream of desertions from the Vietnamese Army. It ignores the difficulty of protecting isolated American bases against the surprise attacks of guerrillas.

It ignores the possibility of an invasion of South Vietnam by the very considerable North Vietnamese Army. It ignores the problem of how an aerial counterattack could cope successfully with a massive ground attack of this character. It ignores the possibility of Chinese intervention. It ignores the logistics and belittles the cost in lives lost, blood spilled and treasure wasted, of fighting a war on a jungle front 7,000 miles from the coast of California.

The whole aim of this group is to expand the Vietnamese war, even if it means drawing in China and perhaps the Soviet Union as well. By its lights, President Johnson's declaration that the United States seeks no wider war is as much a prescription for failure as any attempt at a negotiated peace. It is one thing to say, as Secretary McNamara did in his testimony yesterday, that this country has "no other alternative than continuing to support South Vietnam against the Red guerrilla onslaught." It is quite another to argue that the road out of the present hazardous situation is to invite world destruction. The American people made it overwhelmingly clear in the last election that they do not want to plunge recklessly down that road.

[From the New York Times]

NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate

out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressure on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from North Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made "concrete proposals" for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations and it is quite possible that Peking will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva conference.

Yesterday it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just "advisers"; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that United States policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peking says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if it only knows the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

[From the New York Times]

INDIA URGES CONFERENCE ON VIETNAM

NEW DELHI, February 8.—India's External Affairs Ministry called today for a Geneva-type conference for Vietnam and said it was "essential for a peaceful and enduring solution to the problem."

Shortly after this statement was issued, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri said he was writing to President Johnson and Premier Alexsei N. Kosygin of the Soviet Union

to urge that they meet as soon as possible to insure that peace is not disturbed in southeast Asia.

Mr. Shastri spoke upon emerging from two almost consecutive half-hour meetings with Premier Georges Pompidou of France, who arrived today with his wife and Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville on an 8-day official visit to India. Mr. Pompidou observed that he was glad to say he had found the positions of the French and Indian Governments on Vietnam "very close."

The External Affairs Ministry's statement said, "There should be an immediate suspension of all provocative action in South Vietnam as well as in North Vietnam by all sides."

India is chairman of all three international control commissions set up in Geneva at the seven-power conference of 1954 to maintain peace in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Although not a participant in that conference, India was invited to head the control commissions.

[From the New York Times]

UNITED NATIONS: THE FRUSTRATIONS OF THE U.N.

(By James Reston)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 18.—The weakness of the United Nations was never more obvious than in its present paralysis over the Vietnamese crisis. It could not hope to settle that conflict, for it was never organized to deal with the disputes among the great powers, but at least it was organized to talk, and it is not even talking about Vietnam.

The excuses for not talking about it are clear enough. Three of the four major antagonists in Vietnam—Communist China, North Vietnam, and South Vietnam—are not members of the international organization.

The Communists regard the Vietnamese struggle as an internal war of national liberation, and therefore deny the competence of the U.N. to deal with it. The Soviet Union would veto any action on the question by the Security Council, and the General Assembly is now so dominated by the new nations of Asia and Africa that even the Johnson administration is not sure it would be supported in that body.

SECURITY AND MONEY

Beyond all that, U.N. officials are so worried about the security problems that would arise in New York if the Chinese Communists were to come here to discuss the Vietnamese question that they are not eager to get into the controversy. And they are so concerned about the financial bankruptcy of the U.N. that they are talking more about money and voting than they are about their principal responsibility, which is the maintenance of peace.

Nevertheless, there are at least three arguments for having a U.N. debate on the subject of Vietnam or any other threat to the peace. First, the principles and spirit of the U.N. Charter require it. Second, the U.N. will be weakened even more than it now is if it ignores Vietnam. And third, a U.N. debate might have a restraining effect on the military operations in Vietnam and would probably end with a resolution that would put pressure on both sides to negotiate an honorable settlement.

What is going on now over Vietnam is an increasingly dangerous military struggle amidst a tangle of verbal obscurities and misleading propaganda.

The Communists are engaged there in what they call a "war of national liberation," which any careful debate in the U.N. would expose as nothing more than an international war for Communist domination of the whole country and peninsula.

Washington is also playing the obscurantist game. The President says he "wants no

wider war," but widens it anyway by bombing North Vietnam. These bombing raids, however, are not usually described as "bombings" or as "raids," but as "responses."

HYPOCRISY UNLIMITED

At least a debate in the U.N. would expose this hypocrisy on all sides, including the hypocrisy of our allies, who are treaty-bound to help us in South Vietnam, but are doing nothing of the sort. And while a debate would cause us some embarrassment in the U.N., it would surely make clear the central fact—namely, that Washington went into that country originally to prevent the Communists from overpowering the South Vietnamese in violation of specific international agreements.

The United Nations is in a sad plight. It is broke, but it need not be bankrupt in spirit. More than likely it is not going to be able to take effective military action in the future to oppose aggression, as it did in the Congo.

All it has left, therefore, is the power to talk and clarify, to appeal to the conscience of the peoples, and if it is going to give up this responsibility it will have little or nothing left in the field of international politics.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has tried to get the antagonists in Vietnam into negotiations, but both he and the Pope have been brushed aside—even in Washington.

The main reason for the weakness of the U.N. today, of course, is that its principles have constantly been violated by the Communist nations ever since it was founded 20 years ago. Washington, however, also has to take a part of the blame.

BLOC VOTING

For it was the United States that started the practice of bloc voting in the organization. Now the Communists have taken it up, and with all the new nations from Africa and Asia, they have a bloc that threatens to overwhelm, not only the American bloc, but the principles of the charter as well.

The U.N. cannot be revived, however, by alliance and capitulation. It has to speak out for its principles in the Vietnamese crisis, even if it cannot make them prevail.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

ILLUSIONS AND FALSE ANALOGIES

Assuming that there is still time to think about Vietnam—that the deadly cycle of military escalation is not yet irreversible—Americans should examine the validity of the official rationale for the reprisal bombing of North Vietnam.

The rationale is that attacks on South Vietnamese and American bases are planned, armed and supplied predominantly from the north, and that the attacks will stop if we hit the north hard enough. The fatal flaw in this theory is that the major portion of the weapons used by the Vietcong are American weapons, captured and turned against us. While supplies from the north undoubtedly help the Vietcong, there is little basis for supposing that they are indispensable, or that the Vietcong would fade away if supply lines could be cut—even if the lines could be cut by air action alone, which is most improbable.

Should it not be clear by now that we are not dealing with a simple case of external aggression, as the official policy of our Government assumes? If after 10 years of steadily increasing American aid the South Vietnamese Government is weaker than it was before, then something other than externally supported subversion must be involved.

All the evidence points to a high degree of local sympathy or outright support for the Vietcong as a major element in its success. The bombing of North Vietnam does

not touch this source of conflict and probably strengthens it.

This false assumption of external aggression as the essential element in the situation is strategic as well as tactical. It is one of the major reasons our forces are in Vietnam.

Apologists for official policy are fond of quoting Churchill's warning after the partition of Czechoslovakia in 1938—"The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Czechoslovakia, however, was a victim of direct external aggression. What we face in Vietnam is the quite different problem of an indigenous revolution, 25 years in the making, which has succeeded in ending French colonialism and withstanding 10 years of American intervention.

In such a situation even our great military strength does not give us power to decide, by a simple decision to fight, that a small state shall be "saved." It is one thing to go to the aid of a nation under overt attack, and another to interfere in a local revolution, in which the essential element is not external aid but the people themselves. Only they can "win the war," and after 10 years of not winning, South Vietnam's will and capacity to do so must now be doubted.

Some Americans, of course, believe that it is our national mission to police the world, particularly to police it against revolution. That belief, in our view, is as immature as isolationism was, and indeed may well be an over-reaction to isolationism.

The United States tried to turn its back on the world, and failed; participation in the Second World War established firmly the commonsense proposition that for America involvement in international affairs is unavoidable. But what is involvement? Some Americans evidently swung so far from their isolationist past that they regard involvement as deciding everything for everybody, and particularly deciding the nature and scope of social revolution anywhere. A role in world leadership certainly is the American mission, but we need a more sensible view of what world leadership really is.

The truth is that Vietnam does not present a simple case of external aggression, direct or indirect, and a policy based on that false assumption is bound to fail, as ours has failed for 10 years. No matter how strenuously we may justify the bombing of North Vietnam to ourselves, and no matter how well it might be defended as pure reprisal or revenge, the fact remains that there is no military solution to the problem so far as the United States is concerned.

If we step up our attacks and the degree of our involvement, and even if we do not provoke Chinese or Russian intervention, all we can really expect is to take over the whole war from the South Vietnamese—in other words, to occupy and govern South Vietnam indefinitely.

What would such an occupation gain for us? It would not serve our true national interests, it would poison our relations with half the world, and it would hamper our freedom of maneuver in more important areas of conflict.

Our Vietnam policy is at a dead end. Our interests can now be served only by a political rather than a military solution, one that will enable us ultimately to end a profitless involvement in a profitless Asian land war. Unless President Johnson is seeking a political solution, he is not only risking nuclear war but basing national policy on dangerous illusions.

[From the New York Times]

WASHINGTON: THE UNDECLARED AND UNEXPLAINED WAR

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—The time has come to call a spade a bloody shovel. This country is in an undeclared and unexplained war in Vietnam. Our masters have

a lot of long and fancy names for it, like escalation and retaliation, but it is war just the same.

The cause of the war is plain enough. The North Vietnamese Communists, with the aid of Red China and to a lesser extent the Soviet Union, have sent their guerrillas into South Vietnam in violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva agreements, for the express purpose of taking over the government and territory of South Vietnam.

AMERICA'S RESPONSE

The course of the war is equally plain. We were getting licked in South Vietnam. The Communists were steadily defeating the South Vietnamese armed forces, terrorizing a war-weary and indifferent population, and taking advantage of a divided and quarrelsome South Vietnamese Government.

More than that, the Communists were stepping up their attacks on the bases and barracks which serve the 23,000 American troops in South Vietnam, and it was in response to this that President Johnson ordered the bombing attacks on the Communist military installations in the south of North Vietnamese territory.

Very few people here question the necessity for a limited expansion of the war by U.S. bombers into Communist territory. The American and South Vietnamese position was crumbling fast, and the political and strategic consequences of defeat would have been serious for the free world all over Asia.

There is a point, however, where this exercise will become critical. As the military targets in the southern part of Communist Vietnam are knocked out, and our bombers move northward, they will soon come within the range of the North Vietnamese and Red Chinese Mig fighters, and if we get into that situation, the pressure for attacks on the air bases in North Vietnam and South China will steeply increase.

The immediate problem, therefore, is how to put enough pressure on the North Vietnamese to bring them into negotiations for a settlement of the war, without provoking a mass Communist counterattack we are in no position to meet.

This is a delicate and highly dangerous situation. The United States has the air and naval power to wipe out North Vietnam and the Chinese Air Force, if it comes into the battle. But the North Vietnamese have a quarter of a million men under arms who have never been committed to the battle at all, and few observers in Washington believe this force could be stopped without the intervention of a very large American army on the ground.

THE SILENT WHITE HOUSE

Nobody has made all this clear to the American people. President Johnson has not made a major speech on the details of this war since he entered the White House. Neither did President Kennedy. We have had one long speech on the subject by Secretary of Defense McNamara on March 26 of last year, and a lot of statements here and in Saigon, many of them highly optimistic and misleading. But the fact is that we are in a war that is not only undeclared and unexplained, but that has not even been widely debated in the Congress or the country.

The whole history of this century testifies to the difficulty of predicting the consequences of war. We imposed a policy of unconditional surrender on the Kaiser only to find that the two greater menaces of Communism and Nazism took his place. One of the main objectives of the two World Wars was the freedom of Eastern Europe, which ended up with less freedom under the Communists than it had before.

LIMITING THE WAR

Few people here question that President Johnson wants to limit the war in Vietnam

and avoid a ground war on the continent of Asia, but the future is not wholly in his control. It may be bombing merely to force a negotiated settlement, but the Chinese and the North Vietnamese don't know that. In fact neither do the American people, whose airmen are carrying out the President's orders.

Nor, for that matter, do the allies, who are treaty-bound to support us if we get into a larger war in southeast Asia. They will undoubtedly support a policy of limited retaliation in North Vietnam if it is for the purpose of negotiating a settlement, but they will not support us for long unless we define and limit our aims.

The implications of this war, then, extend far beyond Vietnam. President Johnson's hopes of building a strong alliance with Japan and the other free nations of Asia are not likely to be promoted by replaying the old script of American planes once more bombing Asians.

He has started on a massive program of reconstruction and development at home, but he can forget about his Great Society if he gets bogged down in a major land war in Asia on territory favorable to the enemy. Freedom expands in peace and authoritarian government in war, and this is precisely the danger now, for the Communists have the manpower to cause us an almost unmanageable situation not only in Vietnam but in Korea, and force us into a war that could divert our energies from the larger constructive purposes of the Nation.

In this situation it is difficult to understand why the problem is not discussed more openly by the President, why the terms of an honorable settlement are not defined, and why the negotiating efforts of the Secretary General of the United Nations and other world statesmen are so blithely brushed aside.

It is true that the instability, weakness and sensitivities of the South Vietnamese Government have to be kept in mind, but nobody is suggesting a sellout at their expense. The talk here is not about a Munich agreement but a Korean agreement in which South Vietnam, like South Korea, would be in a better position to order its own life.

This would not be ideal, but it would be better for the South Vietnamese and for the United States than what we have now, and it would be better for North Vietnam and China than a larger war.

CHINA'S DANGER

For if this dangerous game gets out of hand, it is not likely that China's new industries, including her atomic installations at Taklamakan Desert in Central Sinkiang, will be spared. What her manpower can grab beyond her borders would be worth far less than what she would lose at home.

Somebody, however, has to make a move to reverse the trend and stop the present crooked course. For the moment, we seem to be standing mute in Washington, paralyzed before a great issue, and merely digging our thought deeper into the accustomed military rut.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I send you this letter to indicate my appreciation of your article in the January 17 issue of the New York Times magazine, and my support of your demands for negotiations in the Vietnam conflict. My opinion that victory is impossible in Vietnam, and that the United States has no right to sponsor mindless fratricide there is shared by many of my professors and fellow students here at Syracuse University. Please continue to protest current U.S. policy, and persist in your demands for negotiations.

Yours truly,

Miss DALE BABANT.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have restored again my faith in democracy. Enclosed is a copy of my letter to the President in support of your position on South Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

R. DIDCHENKO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I take it upon myself, as a concerned citizen and your supporter, to urge you that you heed the warnings of Senator MORSE and others regarding our policies in South Vietnam.

The honor of a great nation does not require from her leaders to sacrifice the lives of her people rather than admit a past mistake in policy. Our involvement in South Vietnam was a mistake. Let us have wisdom and courage to admit it.

Respectfully yours,

R. DIDCHENKO, Ph. D.

MEDFORD, OREG.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For several months I have been intending to write and thank you for your stand on one great, current issue—our involvement in Vietnam. I thank you. I admire you for your suggestion that we submit the issue to the United Nations. I want to add my bit of support for your efforts.

Of course, I have excuses for not writing you before this. But they are not good excuses. With the current escalation of our military actions in Vietnam and the ever-increasing visibility of our Government's untruthful news releases and stubborn persistence in the same shameful rut, I could no longer delay writing you without violating my conscience further.

I wish sincerely that the current administration would struggle to come up with as visionary ideas for our responsibilities to the poverty stricken and politically repressed people of Vietnam and other nations as they have for such people in our own country.

As long as I have pen in hand I do want to relate another somewhat narrower but, I believe, important concern. That is the VA intention to close a number of their hospital and domiciliarys including the nearby one at White City. If one grants the VA's apparently clear assumption that their responsibility is only for acute medical treatment for veterans it is difficult to refute the logic of their action. Even if one agrees with that assumption, however, I think that one could argue that building new and larger hospitals in the big cities in conjunction with medical schools sometimes results in admissions being based on what do we want to teach the medical student next, rather than on what medical services do the veterans need. In any event I see reasons to argue with their basic assumptions. To point out only one—the domiciliarys were set up as homes, not as hospitals. They were set up to meet a social need of disabled and underprivileged veterans. The Great Society has not yet arrived—there are inadequate economic and social supports for these veterans and the domiciliarys are still providing an essential service to this segment of our poverty stricken society. Whether or not hospitals are associated with these domiciliarys is therefore beside the point.

If the VA is bound and determined to get out of the homes service, I would at least

hope that Congress would pressure them to phase out the domiciliarys over a period of time—so that individual planning for the provision of alternative services could be provided for some of these veterans—rather than shipping them en masse from their own communities to distant parts of the country.

Yours truly,

ROBERT R. GORRKE.

PRINCETON, N.J.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend your opposition to our policy in Vietnam. It takes a great deal of courage to stand against such emotion-laden policies. You have my admiration and unqualified support in your efforts to do so.

The basic trouble in our foreign policy is that it is a holding action designed to preserve the world status quo. But the status quo is an abominable mess. We need a positive policy aimed at accelerating political, economic, and social reforms.

If you will excuse me for departing from the realm of the practical, for my own satisfaction I would like to suggest that the basic planks in our foreign policy should be the following:

1. A massive worldwide program for birth control.
2. The establishment or improvement of public health programs. Most people live at the mercy of disease.
3. A program of agricultural reform and industrial expansion, backed by the kind of money we put into war.
4. The development of education on a worldwide basis. Only in education can we hope to improve men's thinking.
5. Forceful support of movements to establish social justice, which we too often oppose.
6. The encouragement of democratic institutions. Only on this point is even our thinking straight. But I do not think we do much to implement it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. BOWEN.

ELSINORE, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please permit me to tell you that my family and I fully support your stand on Vietnam.

No good, decent person wants the escalation of this useless terrible war. It can only end in a holocaust for the world and what will remain will not be democracy, therefore it must be stopped now.

Wishing you good health and happiness and thank you for your fine leadership.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. NINA HAMMER.

DEAR SIR: In light of the recent events in Vietnam, the Swarthmore Student Council presented the enclosed resolution to referendum to the Swarthmore student body on February 18, 1965. The resolution passed by a vote of 370 to 255, with about 60 percent of the student body voting.

Sincerely yours,

ANN B. MOSELY,

President, Swarthmore Student Council.

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

On the basis of publicly available information concerning the situation in Vietnam, we believe that with each passing week, the situation there poses an increasing threat to world peace. We view with great fear any new military action which would further heighten the danger of escalating the con-

lict. For this reason we strongly protest the recent air strikes against North Vietnam.

Further, we believe that:

1. U.S. attacks on North Vietnam not only violate international law but also increase the possibility of Chinese intervention in the undeclared war.

2. U.S. support of the Khanh regime in South Vietnam is unwarranted on our Government's stated grounds of support for freedom and democracy. It is apparent to all that the Khanh regime lacks the backing of the South Vietnamese people.

3. Military tactics used by the United States in South Vietnam such as defoliation (which destroys crops as well as revealing guerrilla hideouts) and strategic hamlets (which involve the forced eviction of families from their villages) have not been effective and are deplorable on humanitarian grounds.

4. Our Government has failed in its duty to supply the American people with full information on its policies and actions in Vietnam.

We conclude that the use of brinkmanship policies in the grave situation in Vietnam could escalate the war from an internal conflict to a broader struggle. We therefore support a negotiated peace settlement and withdrawal of American military forces from South Vietnam.

NORTH BEND, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Get us out of Vietnam. Let's not worry about dignity—just get out.

We never should have been there, and it won't hurt us as a nation, to admit a mistake.

With your position in the Senate, your knowledge, and your following, you should be able to throw a lot of weight around.

Sincerely yours,

ROSCOE B. HAZEN.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my appreciation for your position regarding our country's illegal and dangerous intervention in Vietnam? Your Denver speech was a masterpiece of logic and intelligent patriotism. Most people seem to be either confused or to feel that it is useless for a citizen to voice an opinion that is contrary to Government policy.

I heard part of a quotation from your remarks regarding our recent bombing of North Vietnam on the radio during the night, but it was never repeated, and I have been unable to find any mention of it in the daily press.

I would appreciate receiving any of your speeches or remarks since your Denver address on December 11, 1964. If possible, I would like to receive any of your future remarks on the above subject without making a separate request on each occasion.

Yours very truly,

MARK FISHER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am so appalled at the undoubted signs our Government has chosen war. Is there nothing to be done? Who is advising the President in such a disastrous course?

I have just read a dreadful article by Hanson Baldwin which I feel is the Government point of view, in the Sunday Times, which must be answered point by point. I do hope you will do this.

I am so grateful to you and the other Senators—GAVENINO, CHURCH, and so on—for your positions on this dangerous situation.

It would be possibly of great importance for you all to answer Hanson Baldwin's shocking article.

Very gratefully,

PHYLLIS BYRNE COX.

ST. HELENE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR: Please use your influence and vote to get a social security medicare bill.

We would like repeal of section 14B, Taft-Hartley Act.

We like your stand on the Vietnamese question.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. CARL KOHLSTRAND.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deep gratitude to you for etanding firm for negotiations. Keep up the fight.

ELIZABETH MOOR.

BANDON, OREG.

Hon. WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: This is to let you know the thoughts and wishes of Mrs. Burris and myself relative to the handling of this country's foreign affairs.

We agree with you that the United States should get out of South Vietnam at once and quit this foolish waste of American lives and resources. France saw the futility of this situation and wisely went home. Such a withdrawal at this time would not mean defeat but if we continue on our present course it can lead only to total war on the Chinese mainland.

We also heartily agree with Dan Smoot that we should abandon Africa completely and withdraw all forms of aid from countries that don't want or don't appreciate it. This country has been dissipating its resources all over the world for many years, surely to the delight of the Communists, while our national debt continues to grow out of control. It is not enough to simply balance the budget, which this country has not done for a long time. It is mandatory that we start to reduce the national debt at once. If we are unable to do so now, when the President reports our national economy is at an all-time high, then we had better give up. We cannot spend our way into prosperity at home, or in city, State or Federal governments.

It is our hope that you use your full power toward getting this country out of all its foolish commitments around the world. Let us discontinue all of our silly giveaway programs and adopt a get-tough policy. Conserve our resources, strengthen our country and reduce our national debt, and all countries will have to respect us. There is no reason why we should be openly insulted and scorned by such petty nations as Cuba, Panama, Africa, and others too numerous to mention, while we continue to pour more money into those same countries than they ever saw. We should take every penny away from them and see how much the Communists want them then. Then get us out of the United Nations. We are footing practically the entire bill and it is unable to accomplish a thing. Their intentions were of the best but they just won't work.

We thank you for the fine stand you are taking in these matters, and also for your kindness in looking out for the welfare of retired Federal civil service employees. May we be fortunate in having you as our Senator for many years.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD T. BURRIS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reference to the Vietnam situation, I would appreciate if I could be advised on what particular legislation the President is carrying on this so-called house-keeping operations in South Vietnam. I am particularly interested in the matter since the Constitution of the United States declares that Congress has the responsibility of declaring war. Is there any particular legislation which has delegated this responsibility to the President under certain conditions of limited warfare. It is a distressing situation. Our failure to adhere to our own Constitution and also fundamental principles of international law is keeping us in a state of turmoil. I would like more enlightenment on the subject.

Sincerely,

DONALD C. WALKER.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: This letter that I am writing may not do much good, for perhaps I am one in a million that would attempt to write their opinion of the things that are prevailing of today which are very wrong, and to my way of thinking, could be curtailed if the heads of our Government would really try to solve these problems now. They say what they will do, but I fail to see action. Perhaps the medicare will not go through for some time, maybe never, but if they would increase the lower bracket social security, people then could perhaps afford their own medical aid. But, how could I as one of many situated the same as I, and I am widowed with \$85 coming in a month. Impossible to do anything with that amount, and this excise tax was to be taken off too—I fail to see that in effect. I think it wrong that social security people should have to pay it. Many people think as I do and I think you will approve too, that Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense said, and I quote—that: "This Vietnam crisis is grave, but by no means hopeless," and expressed doubt the Chinese would step in with a major attack. It's obvious they would. I think he should be removed and many more think the same for if he is left in charge we will surely be involved. We're sitting on a bomb right now, and I don't think the people realize the grave situation we are in. I have a son that was in the World War and a Pearl Harbor survivor, and I have four grandchildren and I'm certainly sure I wouldn't like to see them and many more of our young men involved in another war. So I think they had better get busy and down to earth with some way of solving this serious situation that is hanging over us. I know you have great influence and on these people the masses of people are surely depending for peace and prosperity and to help our own people first.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BEATRICE OERRANS.

BEAVERTON, OREG.

Hon. WAYNE MORRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is written to let you know what my opinions and feelings are concerning some of the matters which are before Congress at the present time.

First, may I say that I'm in agreement with you in regards to the Vietnam problem.

Second, my opinion on Federal aid to schools; well and good if confined to public schools. Private schools and institutions receive enough aid as it is by being tax exempt in many ways. As a church member I believe their business property, investments, and holdings should be taxed. If people think enough of their churches they will

PORTLAND, OREG.

support them. Let church and state remain separated as our wise forefathers intended.

Third, that of foreign aid: It seems to me that a lot of our money has been wasted on those countries that show no appreciation. Why keep trying to buy friendship and respect? We've given away billions—in return for what? Those countries that received money—Egypt, France, etc.—where's the appreciation? They speak for themselves—"Go jump in the ocean," and even now France wants our gold, why can't she apply some of those dollars she has to repay our loan. Yet we still believe that we can buy friendship? Let us cut down on foreign aid and use some of that money in our own country and loan only to those countries that appreciate our aid like little Finland. Please tell Congress to use discretion with our (tax) dollars.

Thank you for listening.

Yours truly,

N. C. THOMPSON.

EUGENE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a Reed College graduate (1961) and a graduate student at the School of Music at the University of Oregon. You have my constant support and affection for your work in the Senate. I consider your stand on Vietnam a really courageous act. Is there any chance we can get out of there?

I feel so terribly uninformed about Vietnam—where can I find out what is really going on?

With respect,

JON APPLETON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a short note to voice my admiration of your long and hard battle against our involvement in South Vietnam. Developments in that area of the world certainly point to the correctness of your views. I hope you will continue your fight for reason—particularly for the involvement of the U.N.—in the Vietnam problem.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM WOLFERT.

LANDERBERG, PA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just to let you know that I am fully in agreement with your opposition to our further involvement in Vietnam.

Why not let the U.N. give it a try as U Thant has suggested?

Sincerely yours,

V. WEINMAYER.

OLMETEAD FALLS, OHIO.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard over the radio this talk you gave at the City Club in Cleveland, Friday, February 19.

We thought your talk an excellent one and wished every city in our country could have heard the talk and the questions after your speech which you answered very well.

If the people of our country could hear the truth about Vietnam as you gave it in your talk to the City Club, the administration's actions in Vietnam would be ended soon; immediately.

I would like to have a copy of this talk. If you have many copies, please send me several. We can get it reproduced in Cleveland and distribute several hundred copies.

Thank you very much for giving the truth to the American people.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. VIVIAN WILSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As I read Hanson Baldwin's article in the New York Times Magazine section yesterday, I became filled with terror. Can our country be so arrogant, so reckless as to risk total war over Vietnam, an area in which we have no business entrenching ourselves, and where we are hated by the overwhelming majority of the people?

I applaud your courage in speaking out, almost alone in the Senate, and I want you to know that many people are behind you.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. CLAUDIA ZAELAVEKY.

OAKLAND, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support you 100 percent in your opposition to our presence in Vietnam. Please keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

NELLE K. MORAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SENATOR: You are fighting for all the men in U.S. forces in southeast Asia and for the people there and for us here.

We believe that you will not give up no matter what the administration may do.

Thanking you very truly,

ARTHUR AND HELEN BERTHOLF.

VENICE, CALIF.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courage and integrity in becoming the spokesman for an unpopular view regarding our policy in Vietnam is sincerely appreciated.

We strongly oppose bombing of North Vietnamese supply lines or extending the war in Vietnam.

We urge you to continue to do all in your power to bring about immediate negotiation.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MARILYN HORN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend you on your forthright position in demanding U.S. withdrawal and negotiations in South Vietnam. We have written letters to President Johnson and to our congressional delegation to do likewise.

We need more representatives like you in Congress.

Sincerely,

SARA ALCHERMES.
ERNEST J. ALCHERMES.

SALEM, OREG.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing in regard to the situation in Vietnam. I understand how you feel in regard to this. Before more pressure builds up to attack the North, vigorous efforts should be made to negotiate an end to the war. The U.N. should have a vital role in this. What South Vietnam needs is an internationally supported program to establish stable government. We all know this, but how to accomplish it is the problem.

Sincerely,

ELLA B. BRADFORD.

NARRAGANSETT, R.I.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the good work re South Vietnam.

FRANK G. WIENER.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are solidly back of your efforts to persuade the U.S. Government to try to negotiate an end to the war in Indochina.

If negotiations should fail, we should not under any circumstances commit a larger land army to the mainland of Asia. In the long run it would be a trap and sure suicide for thousands of our men, if we tried to beat the unlimited manpower of China on the ground.

China entered Korea when she was much weaker, and the present government had been in power only 3 years.

If we invade to the north, I believe China would enter an unlimited number of soldiers to stop us, and her millions could not be stopped.

We are a great sea and air power, and I believe we could hold the Pacific and the islands now in our possession indefinitely. Let's withdraw from the mainland now, while it is possible.

Please continue your efforts.

Yours truly,

GEORGE M. GATES.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the last 2 weeks I have sent a pair of wires to President Johnson and a letter to each of the Ohio Senators. In these messages I deplored escalation of the conflict in Vietnam and urged our immediate withdrawal. In any event, I want those who have spoken up for disengagement in Vietnam to know that their views are not without some support among the citizens of Ohio.

If it was not apparent previously, the events of this weekend, which found our South Vietnamese allies turning the weapons we supplied them against each other, surely prove beyond any doubt that defense of South Vietnam is impossible (short of establishing a government of occupation and committing all of our resources). And though loss of South Vietnam would be regrettable, isn't this inevitable in any event? We cannot hope to win a land war in Asia, should China become a participant, and surely not even the administration is prepared to make good upon that eventually. This means that all of Vietnam must ultimately come under the influence of her powerful neighbor. And deplore this as we must, it is foolhardy to commit our prestige and the lives of our citizens in a quixotic adventure bound to end in failure.

My main concern, however, is not for our prestige. What I fear most immediately is that increasingly reckless actions growing out of a hopeless situation will plunge the world into nuclear war. By our rash attacks of 2 weeks ago we entered upon a course which if continued can only lead to the entrance of China and the Soviet Union, and at last—unless God should intervene—the final world war.

I love my country and I value the peace of the world too much to keep silent at such a time. Nothing, no cause, no principle—certainly nothing so insubstantial as prestige, can ever justify risking the destruction of America in nuclear war. And though tough talk may appeal to some of our countrymen, there will be only curses—and no applause, on that day of doom that brings the bomb to the United States.

The President is playing Russian roulette with American security. I urge you to do everything in your power to end this deadly

game, calling for the sane and reasonable conduct of our foreign policy in a very dangerous world.

Most sincerely,

PAUL G. SCHMIDT.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I urge you to work for a peaceful, negotiated settlement in Vietnam and to oppose a continuation or an escalation of this fruitless conflict. We are indeed losing this war, not because of intervention by North Vietnam but because the Vietcong, a basically indigenous movement, has the support of the South Vietnamese people. In a situation which called for political and economic measures, we chose to rely on military force.

The disastrous results of this policy are now obvious. We cannot win this war. Escalation only leads to the prospect of a larger war in Asia with North Vietnam and possibly China; this larger conflict in turn would probably lead to a general nuclear war. The situation demands a peaceful settlement; the American people want a peaceful settlement, not a larger war. Therefore I urge you to continue to speak out and to express your dissatisfaction with our present policy. We must begin negotiations now with all interested parties to work for a peaceful and neutralized Vietnam. There is no alternative to a negotiated settlement except a general war.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. CORT.

DEAR SIR: My name is Mrs. Jo Ann Heltsley of 496 Brittain Road, Akron, Ohio.

I was listening to the news this evening and heard a portion of the speech you made concerning the United States and Vietnam. I have heard many speeches concerning Vietnam but you seemed to be just about the only one who feels as I do.

I have a special interest in Vietnam due to losing my husband there.

His name was Pfc. Paul R. Heltsley, III, RA-15675814, the first Akron area serviceman to die in Vietnam. He was killed July 17, 1964, while accompanying a patrol as a medic on a combat mission.

I guess I'll never understand the Vietnam problem. In the telegram I received from the War Department it said he was killed by hostile action while on a combat mission. I also have received many letters from servicemen in Vietnam concerning my husband's death, or should I say murder. Even President Johnson wrote me telling me my husband died while performing duties for his country.

I wrote President Johnson shortly after receiving his letter asking him some questions. As I told him, I have a baby girl who will never know her father. Some day I'm going to have to explain his death to her. How can I possibly explain something I don't understand?

Before my husband's death he wrote many letters concerning Vietnam. How the people wouldn't fight for themselves, how his buddies were getting killed each day, and how he wanted to come home safely.

It seems like all President Johnson can say is, "Be proud of him, as we are, he died for something we as Americans believe in."

I don't feel Johnson or anyone can know how helpless we are in Vietnam until you lose someone there. I'm not only speaking for myself, but for the other American people who have lost sons, husbands, and fathers in this so-called undeclared war.

Before my husband left the United States he told me he would receive hazard-duty pay, also \$10,000 insurance in case of death. This proved to be untrue. I guess the Gov-

ernment doesn't feel he was in the danger zone. If this is true I'd like to know why he was in the combat zone. I've also been told that there is no insurance on the men unless the United States declares war.

I can't understand why our men are giving their lives in a war that isn't a war. Maybe someday I'll be able to explain to my daughter the truth about Vietnam, if it's ever brought out in the open. I just wanted you to know that there's an awful lot of good Americans who feel the same way about Vietnam as you do.

May God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JO ANN HELTSLEY.

IDLEYLD PARK, GREG.

WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon State Senator,
Eugene, Ore.

DEAR SIR: I wish to go on record that I desire a cease fire in Vietnam and a negotiated settlement.

I know what your personal opinion on this matter has always been, and I admire you for speaking out. Some of the rest of us wish to speak out also.

On the radio news this morning I heard this statement made by Senator Church, of Idaho, then the commentator added that much of the mail voicing this opinion would be "Communist inspired."

I wish to state that I am most certainly not "Communist inspired," and I know many people who hold this opinion who are not.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HELEN DAVIS.

[From the New York Times]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON VIETNAM: LET US TAKE THE INITIATIVE

Each day we hear fresh news from Vietnam, news both strange and grim. We strike by air in reprisal against North Vietnam because our soldiers, not as armed technicians and advisers to an army which cannot yet guard them well, have been attacked in their barracks in the very heart of South Vietnam. We have widened the war—how wide will it become?

Fear of escalation of this undeclared war against North Vietnam mounts with each sudden report of renewed violence. Unless the situation is very different from what it appears to be, we have lost the political initiative in Vietnam and are attempting to substitute military actions for political ones. We face grave risks in Vietnam. Americans have faced even graver risks for good and high cause, Mr. President, but we must first understand why we must take such risks. What are our goals in Vietnam? Are they just? Can they be accomplished? Are they truly worth what they are bound to cost in dollars and human lives?

With whom are we allied in Vietnam? Are our soldiers fighting side-by-side with troops of a representative and legitimate national government, or are we embroiled in defense of an unpopular minority in a fierce and costly civil war? Our representatives assure us that we and the Saigon government have the overwhelming support of the Vietnamese people. How can this be so? On the same day that Mr. McNamara said sneak attacks upon our soldiers cannot be prevented, an American officer on the scene in Vietnam declared that "any of the people in the hamlet over there could have warned us that the Vietcong were around, but they did not warn us." The weapons used against us are most often American weapons, captured from or surrendered by the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. President, we submit that weak field intelligence in South Vietnam and a steady loss of workable weapons to the enemy are deep symptoms of an unpopular cause.

Why are we fighting in Vietnam? Mr. President, we think we understand why we went into Vietnam after the French withdrew. It was because this Nation hoped to encourage the development of a popular, stable, and democratic government which would help to lead all southeast Asia toward lasting peace. Historical, political, social, religious and sectional factors have prevented this development. The original assumptions are no longer valid. We have become increasingly unwelcome everywhere in southeast Asia. Our presence seems to deepen, rather than to relieve, the bitterness and hostility of the people. It was only 10 years ago that the Vietnamese defeated a French army of nearly half a million men. Will the same battles occur again?

Can we win in Vietnam? Mr. President, we know that our Nation has sufficient firepower to destroy the entire world. We also know that you do not wish to call upon this awesome power. How can we possibly win and yet prevent a widening of this conflict? How can we win in Vietnam with less than 30,000 "advisers" when the French could not win with an army of nearly half a million fighting both north and south of the present dividing frontier?

Is it worth the cost? The French defeat in Indochina cost them 172,000 casualties. Yet, before their final bloody defeat at Dien Bien Phu, the French generals and diplomats spoke with the same toughness and optimism, the same assurances we now hear from our leaders.

The French had overwhelming numbers and firepower but they lost in Vietnam because they lacked the support of the population. Do we face the same prospect, or are there facts which the public does not know which show our situation to be clearly different?

Mr. President, we are aware that you have secret information which cannot be shared with us. But could such information completely refute the picture of events and the political insights provided to us by serious newspapermen who have been in the area for years?

All we can see is a seemingly endless series of demonstrations and riots in Saigon and Hue, of military coups, of threats and challenges to the dignity of our Ambassador and our other representatives by the very men we seek to sustain in power.

We have lost the initiative in Vietnam. A few guerrillas can trigger American reactions that widen the war. The events of the past week are leading step by step along the path to war with China.

Would it not be both prudent and just to take the initiative toward peace in Vietnam? If we are not to widen the war beyond all conscience, as reasonable men we must initiate negotiations while there is still time.

Amherst College: Henry Commager, history; Van R. Halsey, administration; William M. Hexter, biology; Philip T. Ives, biology; Allen Kropf, chemistry; Edward R. Leadbetter, biology; Leo Marx, English; John Pemberton, religion; Oscar E. Schotte, biology; Marc Silver, chemistry; Henry T. Yost, biology.

Andover-Newton Theological College: Weener Fallaw, religion; Nels F. S. Ferris, theology; Norman K. Gottwald, Old Testament; John C. Scammon, Old Testament.

Bates College: Leland Bechtel, education; Walter Boyce, administration; Robert M. Chute, biology; Robert Hatch, health; George Healy, Peter Jontis, sociology; Robert Peck, health; Richard Sampson, mathematics; Richard Warpe, speech.

Boston University: George D. W. Berry, philosophy; Bernard Chasan, physics; Joseph Cochran, pharmacology; Robert S. Cohen, physics; Paul K. Deane, Jr., theology; Alvin

Flering, film; George Hein, chemistry; Carc' Kaye, psychiatry; Conan Kornetsky, pharmacology; John H. Lavelly, philosophy; Allan I. Mireky, psychiatry; Bernard S. Phillips, sociology; Freda Rebecksky, psychology; Melvin Rezenthal, psychiatry; Julius A. Roth, sociology; Nancy St. John, basic studies; Armand Siegel, physics; Robert H. Sprout, English; John J. Stachel, physics; Gerald Steehler, psychiatry; Max W. Wartofsky, philosophy; Charles E. Willie, physics; Alvin D. Zallinger, sociology; Howard Zinn, government.

Bowdoin College: Philip M. Brown, economics; Thomas Cornell, art; Luis O. Coxé, engineering; Clarence Davies, government; John C. Donovan, government; Reginald Hanoaford, English; Ernst C. Helmreich, history; Gordon Hiebert, chemistry; John Howland, biology; Charles E. Huntington, biology; Gerald Kamber, French; Fritz O. A. Kollin, German; Albert Nunn, French; Marvin Sadik, art; James A. Storer, economics; William B. Whiteside, history.

Brandeis University: Rose Abendstren, languages; Herbert H. Attekar, sociology; Max Christen, physics; Saul Cohen, chemistry; Lewis A. Coser, sociology; George L. Cowgill, anthropology; Herman T. Epstein, biology; Jerrold Fassman, biochemistry; Kenneth B. Feigenbaum, psychology; Gordon A. Fellman, sociology; David H. Fleisher, history; Lawrence Fuchs, history; David G. Gil, sociology; Ray Ginger, history; Jack Goldstein, physics; Theodore Goodfriend, biochemistry; Stephen J. Grendzier, languages; Mary E. Griffin, English; Eugene Gross, physics; Allan Grossman, English; Lawrence Grossman, biochemistry; Lincoln D. Hammond, languages; Thomas C. Hollocher, biochemistry; Mary Ellen Jones, biochemistry; David Kaplan, anthropology; Nathan Kaplan, biochemistry; Attila O. Klein, biology; Laurence Levine, biochemistry; Henry Linschitz, biochemistry; Alvin Lucier, music; Robert Manners, anthropology; Herbert Marcuse, philosophy; William Murakami, biochemistry; Joseph F. Murphy, politics; Robert O. Preyer, English; Murray Sachs, languages; Benson Saler, anthropology; Gordon Sato, biochemistry; Silvan Schweber, physics; Philip E. Slater, sociology; B. Z. Sobel, sociology; Morris Soodak, biochemistry; Mark Spivak, sociology; Maurice Stein, sociology; Maurlee Sueman, biology; Helen Van Vunakis, biochemistry; John Vickers, philosophy; E. V. Walter, sociology; Roland L. Warren, sociology; Alex Weingrod, anthropology; Harold Welsberg, philosophy; Robert S. Weiss, sociology; John Wight, engineering; Kurt H. Wolff, sociology; Irving K. Zola, sociology.

Clark University: J. Richard Reid, languages; Morton Wiener, psychology; Charles Belnderman, English; Abraham Blum, psychology; Walter H. Crockett, psychology; Bernard Kaplan, psychology, and Philip G. Gison, sociology.

Harvard University: Harold Amos, medical school; French Anderson, medical school; Ralph Balerlein, physics; Guy O. Barnett, medicine; Reuben Brower, English; Lawrence Burkholder, divinity; Ian Cooke, biology; Frank Moore Cross, Jr., languages; R. Damadian, medical school; Bernard D. Davis, medical school; David Denhardt, biology; E. S. Dethlefsen, biology; Donald T. Dublin, medical school; Michael T. Dublin, medical school; Michael Eddin, medical school; John Edsell, biology; Leon Ehrenpreis, mathematics; Rupert Emerson, government; Ann Farnham, medical school; John Felstiner, English; Donald Fleming, history; A. S. Freedberg, medical school; Walter Gilbert, physics; Philip Gold, chemistry; Irving H. Goldberg, medical school; Luigi Gorini, medical school; David Cavers, law; Howard H. Hlatt, medical school; H. Stuart Hughes, history; Stanley Katz, history; Gordon D. Kaufman, theology; Eugene P. Kennedy, medical school; John

law, chemistry; Jeana Levinthal, medical school; Bernard Lown, public health; Carlton Jale, history of science; Jean Mayer, public health; Everett Mondelsohn, history of science; Matthew Messelson, biology; John E. Murdoch, history of science; Martin Peretz, government; Elmer Pfefferkorn, medical school; Edward P. Radford, Jr., public health; John R. Raper, biology; Herbert Richardson, theology, divinity; W. R. Riddington, Jr., anthropology; Paul A. Riemann, divinity; Gerald Rosenthal, economics; Robert Rotberg, history; William M. Sacks, astronomy; Victor W. Sidel, preventive medicine; Raymond Siever, geology; Steven Smith, philosophy; Joseph L. Snider, physics; Rui Soeiro, medical school; Max Stackhouse, ethics, divinity; Edward A. Sweeney, dental medicine; John T. Tate, mathematics; Karl Teeter, linguistics; George Wald, biology; Thomas H. Wilson, medical school; Marvin Winkler, biochemistry, and Daniel Wulff, biology.

College of the Holy Cross: William Van Etten Casey, theology; Thomas Coffee, sociology; John Dorenkamp, english; James Gross, economics; William Guindon, physics, and Paul Rosenkrantz, psychology.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Marcia K. Allen, biology; Maria Bade, biology; Eugene Bell, biology; Aron Bernstein, physics; P. Bon, modern languages; Michael Brower, management; Gene M. Brown, biochemistry; Joel E. Brown, biology; Stephen L. Chorover, psychology; Charles O. Coryell, chemistry; Richard M. Douglas, humanities; Carla Dowben, biology; Robert Dowben, biology; Maurice Fox, biology; Steven Gilborn, humanities; Marvin Goody, architecture; Glen Gordon, nuclear chemistry; Bernard Gould, biology; Charles Gross, psychology; Theodore Gurney, Jr., biology; Albert Gurney, humanities; Alan Hein, psychology; Richard Held, psychology; Charles Hoyt, biology; Kerson Huang, physics; Thomas Jackson, humanities; William Jackson, electrical engineering; Elizabeth Jones, biology; Karl Kornacker, biology; Edwin Kuh, management and economics; Cyrus Levinthal, biology; S. E. Luria, biology; Kevin Lynch, city planning; B. McCune, modern languages; Boris Magasanik, biology; Diane Major, biology; Travis Merritt, humanities; Franco Modigliani, economics; Philip Morrison, physics; Irwin Oppenheim, chemistry; R. B. Pan, modern languages; David Perlmutter, modern languages; Norman Pettit, humanities; Louis Pfeiffer, psychology; Helen Revel, biology; P. W. Robbins, biochemistry; Ronald Rolfe, biology; R. H. Ruby, biology; David L. Sebalk, humanities; Robert Sekuler, psychology; David Shosmaker, chemistry; William Siebert, electrical engineering; O. R. Simha, administration; Malcolm Skolnick, physics; Cyril Smith, humanities and metallurgy; Marvin Stodolsky, biology; N. S. Sutherland, psychology; James Thomson, humanities; Patrick Wall, biology; William B. Watson, humanities; John S. Waugh, chemistry; Joseph Weizenbaum, electrical engineering; Burton White, psychology; Robert Zimmermann, biology; Arnulf Zweig, humanities, and Alexander Rich, biology.

University of Massachusetts: Don E. Abramson, speech; Robert Agard, library; Dean A. Allen, health services; Leon Barron, English; Philip R. Biddle, speech; Milton Cantor, history; Jules Chametsky, English; Mario S. DePillis, history; David Clark, English; T. P. Dikes, history; Louis A. Gelhard, history; Arthur Gentile, botany; F. Greeley, forestry; Richard Haven, English; Joseph Hazens, health services; Vincent Iardi, history; C. A. Johnson, agricultural engineering; Joseph Langland, English; David P. Leonard, history; Guenter Lewy, government; David Porter, English; William J. Price, speech; Howard H. Quint, history; Trevor Robinson, chemistry; Ann Sagan, history; Jay Savareid, speech; A. S. W. Sheffield, forestry; Richard S. Stein, chemistry; Jack M.

Thompson, history; Richard H. Towers, history; Ronald D. Ware, history; J. W. Zahradnik, agricultural engineering; Arthur H. Westing, forestry.

Northeastern University: Richard Arnowitz, physics; Philip Backstrom Jr., history; Terry Blalor, anthropology; Wallace Bishop, history; Roger Brighthill, psychology; Rose Laub Coser, sociology; Henry H. Crapo, mathematics; Alan H. Cromer, physics; Ellen H. Dunlap, mathematics; Marvin H. Friedman, physics; Mitzl Filson, library; Norbert Fullington, history; Michael J. Glaubman, physics; Stephan Golburgh, education; Joseph Greaser, chemistry; Barry Karger, chemistry; Frank Lee, anthropology; Milton Leitenberg, biology; Harold Naldus, chemistry; Dolores Newton, anthropology; Irene A. Nichols, education; J. David Oberholzer, physics; Louis Roberts, English; Fred Rosenberg, biology; Deborah S. Roseblatt, modern languages; Norman Rosenblatt, history; Eugene J. Salentan, physics; George Salzman, physics; Ina Samuels, psychology; Burt Scharf, psychology; Stan Stenbridge, history; Harold L. Stubbs, mathematics; H. T. Tloeh, chemistry; Harold Zamaskey, psychology.

University of Rochester: Albert B. Craig, Jr., physiology; John A. Ernest, mathematics; Joseph Frank, English; William D. Lotspeich, physiology; William F. Neuman, radiation biology; Arnold W. Ravin, biology; Hayden V. White, history.

Simmons College: Frederick Anderson, philosophy; Tilden Edelstein, history; Bruce Hawthorne, history; John Hunter, history; Sumner Rosen, economics; James Newman, French; Georgia Noble, education; Richard Clark Sterne, English.

Smith College: Gladys Anslow, physics; Leonard Baskin, art; George Burt, music; Eli Chinoy, sociology; Jean Cohen, psychology; Louis Cohn-Haft, history; Thomas S. Deer, chaplain; John Duke, music; Robert Fabian, mathematics; Philip Green, government; Bruce Hawkins, physics; David C. Huntington, art; Rita Jules, education; Alice Lazerowitz, philosophy; Morris Lazerowitz, philosophy; D. Bruce Marshall, government; Elliott Offner, art; Patricia Olmsted, administration; Harold Poor, history; Michael Rice, physics; Peter N. Rowe, government; Ramon Eduardo Ruiz, history; Paul H. Seton, psychology; J. Diedrick Snook, psychology; A. H. Specs, physics; Melvin Steinberg, physics; Sten Stenson, religion; John Van Doren, English; Renee Watkins, history.

Tufts University: Betty Burch, government; Kalman A. Burnim, drama; Dean Ashley Campbell, engineering; Ernest Cassara, theology; John Conwall, economics; Dorothea J. Crook, psychology; Michael Fixler, English; Sanford J. Freedman, psychology; Bernard W. Harleston, psychology; Hilde Hein, philosophy; Percy Hill, engineering; Franklin D. Holzman, economics; Albert H. Imlah, history; David Isles, mathematics; William S. Jacobson, English; Leonard Kirsch, economics; Mary Jane Kramer, sociology; Zella Luria, psychology; Bernard McCabe, English; Robert L.H. Miller, religion; A. William Mills, psychology; Thornton Roby, psychology; Nancy L. Roelker, history; Laura M. Roth, physics; H. Ronald Rouse, mathematics; Allen Schick, government; Edwin Schur, sociology; Sylvia Sherwood, sociology; Newlin R. Smith, economics; Jack Tessman, physics; Frank W. Wicker, psychology.

Wellesley College: Roberta Blackburn, English; Thomas Blackburn, chemistry; Walter Houghton, English; Clifford Noll, English.

Wesleyan University: Samuel W. Anderson, psychology; James A. Carlo, psychology; Richard C. DeBolt, psychology; David P. McAllester, anthropology; Norman Rudich, languages; Richard Winslow, music.

Others: Edgar D. Bell, Littleton; Arthur W. Chickering, Goddard College; Dorothy D. Carlo, Yale; Edward J. Collins, Boston College; Irvin Doreas, Cardinal Cushing College;

Paul Gross, Brown University; Francis W. Holmes, Bernard Howard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; Seymour Lederberg, Brown University; Raymond T. McNally, Boston College; David Todd, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; J. Huston Westover, Acton.

(Institutional affiliation for purposes of identification only.)

If you approve of this statement, reprint it in other newspapers and write or wire President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.

This open letter is being published as an advertisement paid by the signers. Comments and contributions toward cost should be sent to Ad Hoc Committee for Open Letter on Vietnam, Post Office Box 35, Belmont, Mass., Prof. Salvador E. Luria, chairman; Prof. Cyrus Levinthal, treasurer.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

AN INCREDIBLE SITUATION

The Senate Democratic leader, MIKE MANSTRIELO, of Montana, is putting it mildly when he terms conditions in South Vietnam "an incredible situation." He says the squabbling generals should take notice that the United States is not committed to support the situation that now exists.

South Vietnam is pretty close to anarchy. Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, the strong man for 13 months, was bounced over the weekend by a group of quarreling generals. The latest civilian government installed a few days ago by General Khanh is still nominally in power. But Khanh is out. So it seems almost irrelevant for Washington officials to say the United States is continuing full support of the civilian regime. What is to be supported?

The situation is going from worse to worse. The Communist-led Vietcong have now virtually cut South Vietnam in two and continue to make gains. U.S. troops are keeping the war going, but it is a losing struggle. The United States might have profited from its recent retaliatory air raids on North Vietnam by maneuvering for negotiations in the hope that it could seep from a strengthened position, but that potential initiative has been lost.

Instead, Washington dispatches say the administration is firmly resisting all efforts by Allied governments to bring about a negotiated political settlement. If this is so, it also is an incredible situation. The arguments of French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville, General de Gaulle's top foreign policy expert, apparently fell on deaf ears. Couve de Murville spent an hour with President Johnson last week; he reportedly told the Chief Executive he thinks North Vietnam and Red China would be interested in negotiations. He urged the United States to seek a political solution immediately.

This may be distasteful, but what is the alternative in the absence of a Saigon government ready, willing, and able to carry on? It would be comforting to think that the Americans, the Russians, and the Chinese do not mean precisely what they say, that somewhere in the diplomatic underground people are talking privately about public conference. That would be a sensible and statesmanlike procedure; we only hope there is more to it than the stuff of dreams.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,
Boston, Mass.

Mr. MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a 22-year-old senior at Boston University. Although I am a New York State resident voter, I wish to applaud you for taking a stand in favor of peaceful negotiations in Vietnam.

I sincerely believe in working toward peace positively. I am very pleased the U.S. Government has created and is continuing the

February 25

Peace Corps. I also deeply believe in democracy and defending the United States and I am anxious to prevent communism from dominating the world. However, I am aware of the unique conditions under which the United States developed its political system. I am cognizant also of the fact many of the underdeveloped countries seem to need a socialistic form of government to cope with their basic problems such as hunger and land distribution. I do not equate socialism with Russian or Red Chinese communism necessarily. I believe that each country should develop this type of government which most successfully helps it grow.

I believe our foreign policy in South Vietnam has been and is being mishandled badly. It is as much a fault of Americans' indifference as it is of this Government. Our policy has been and is immoral. We are supporting a government which is supported by 30 percent of the South Vietnamese at the most. Even worse for us, we are working against a main goal in the cold war. By our current militant strategy, we are pushing Russia and Red China closer together and forcing North Vietnam closer to them.

In view of the rise of nationalism in the world and the fact the fighting in Vietnam began as a civil war, I am not certain that Red China would dare to militarily occupy Vietnam if we withdrew from South Vietnam.

It is basically for these reasons that I am in favor of peaceful negotiations in Vietnam. I gravely hope that this Government as a whole will have your courage and vision to recognize our errors and turn toward negotiation to settle the Vietnam crisis instead of edging the world further toward destruction.

To have any type of successful negotiations, it may well be necessary to include Red China. If it is, I would be in favor of such action.

I have also written to Senators KENNEDY and JAVRA and President Johnson, stating my beliefs.

Yours truly,

Mrs. NANCY MOORE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Care of Illinois Institute of Technology,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed article on Vietnam and our actions there, appeared in a prominent Canadian magazine this week. In view of your great interest in the deplorable South Vietnam situation, I deemed it important enough to place in your hands. The author, a well-known RCAF officer and a former member of the International Control Commission would have little reason to magnify the situation but apparently has been able to publish in Canada, views which would be heavily censored in our country.

Whether we should remain in Vietnam or not, we are there and apparently making the same mistakes we did in Korea, only this time, we aren't supposed to be at war.

I feel confident that not only will this article furnish you with material you would want to have but that you will continue to force the issue with all this vigor so prevalent in your distinguished career.

Sincerely,

ROY B. NORHEIMER.

HUGH CAMPBELL SAYS—THE AMERICANS ARE THEIR OWN WORST ENEMIES IN VIETNAM

The United States is now entering its third year of full-scale war in Vietnam. Any day now we can expect the customary New Year pronouncement from the American high command in Saigon to the effect that, while the situation is serious, it is not hopeless; and that the war can and will be won.

After nearly 2 years in Vietnam, I've heard a good many such assurances. But since, as a Canadian delegate on the three-nation International Control Commission, I had a

unique opportunity to observe the war from both sides of the firing line, I think the Americans are talking through their well padded brass hats. The war, as it's now being waged, cannot be won by our side—because the Americans, for all their blarney talk about developing new antiguerrilla techniques, are still using obsolete methods to fight a new kind of invisible enemy.

Exactly how invisible this enemy—the Communist Vietcong—can become was forcibly demonstrated to me one day on a dusty gravel road leading through the jungle in North Vietnam. It was a routine inspection patrol for the International Control Commission and, for no apparent reason, the Communist officer in the lead jeep suddenly suggested a halt. We piled out of our jeeps and stretched our legs, apparently in the middle of nowhere. Just as inexplicably, he then suggested we resume the patrol. As the convoy started off, he beeped his horn and, somewhere nearby, a whistle shrilled.

Instantly, both sides of the road were lined with troops, grinning infantrymen whose faded khaki uniforms contrasted sharply with the dark jungle background. They'd been there all this while, standing not a dozen yards from the convoy. But because of the foliage that covered their backs from helmet to canvas sneakers, they'd been invisible to three experienced military officers.

There was nothing threatening about this mock ambush. The Communist troops were simply practicing camouflage, and used the International Control Commission as an unwitting umpire. And although their camouflage was excellent, it was the mobility of the troops that impressed me most. They were many miles from any known base, and they carried on their backs everything necessary for living and fighting. They didn't need roads, jeeps, helicopters, or mobile kitchens. They were jungle fighters, as elusive as poison gas and twice as deadly—the kind of guerrillas who wore down the French masters of Indochina, and finished them off at Dien Bienphu in 1954.

The Pentagon, naturally, has been determined not to repeat France's mistakes. In the past 3 years they've poured in aid and advisers at the rate of more than a million dollars a day. So generous, so overwhelming has been this avalanche of assistance, that it's aided South Vietnam almost to death.

In 1962, there were fewer than 300 U.S. military advisers in the country—and they were making noticeable headway against the Vietcong. The advisers were scattered in tiny detachments around the country. They were tough, highly trained men, and they were revered by the Vietnamese.

But the Pentagon apparently reasoned that 20,000 advisers could win the war 20 times as fast as 300; they started airlifting them into Saigon by the thousands (in defiance, incidentally, of the Geneva truce agreement). With them came wives, children, PX supermarkets, Coca-Cola machines, air conditioners, officers' clubs, station wagons, insurance salesmen, schoolteachers, public relations men—all the equipment of a progressive suburb, without which the American military seems unable to function abroad. Suddenly, it stopped being a jungle war, with Americans fighting on the same terms as their enemies. It became instead a desk-soldiers' war, with the fatuities of Saigon's brass hats canceling the efforts of the men in the field. A gap appeared between the South Vietnamese and their American protectors, and the gap has been widening ever since.

There's also a gap between the Pentagon's concept of mobility and that of the guerrillas. Putting troops on wheels or in helicopters has proven unrealistic in a jungle war. Disguised as peasants, the Vietcong simply watch the machines charge futilely by—perhaps into a mine trap or ambush or, if they're detected, simply melt into the

jungle. Pursuit on foot is fruitless; the South Vietnamese troops, carrying enough American-made equipment to fight the Battle of the Bulge, would be ineffective even if they were as hardy as their enemy. But of course they aren't, since they're now accustomed to riding to work.

But all these mistakes haven't been committed by the military. There are a host of non-military agencies fighting Saigon's war, from the spooks of the CIA to the flacks of the U.S. Information Agency. They frequently operate at cross-purposes and, in general, it may be said that they do not enhance America's image abroad.

Taks, for instance, the unintentional but revealing case of the American pro football player who arrived in Saigon under State Department auspices to set up an athletic program for the Vietnamese. "Gonna teach these gooks football," he announced to all within earshot. Several days later, he announced a change in policy; the gooks, he'd decided, were too small for football—so he was going to teach them soccer, a game he'd never played himself.

Or take the average American service wife in Saigon: for boorishness, offensiveness and condescension toward her inferiors, she takes the fur-lined mug. The generous allowances, PX privileges, villa, chauffeur and servants are all new to her—and with rare exceptions, it shows. Her kids are no better. The spectacle of a bunch of crew-cutted, gum-chewing teenagers lording it over the natives in the streets of Saigon is a lesson in how not to conduct foreign relations.

Or, finally, take the matter of Saigon's justly famous night life, which consists of scores of saloons, each equipped with a bevy of the prettiest little bar girls in southeast Asia. These patrons are almost exclusively American; and one South Vietnamese woman, who owns a string of such establishments, told me she estimates that half her girls are actively pro-Vietcong, while the rest maintain a profitable neutrality by spying impartially for both sides. Multiply this example by a hundred, and you have an effective intelligence network—and an explanation for the failure of so many well-planned, secret sorties against the Vietcong.

The result of all this ugly Americanism has been exactly what you'd expect: the South Vietnamese is starting to wonder if his Communist enemies might not be preferable to his American friends. Once he publicly mourned this loss of American lives. Now, the nearly 300 Americans killed in Vietnam seem meaningless compared with his own terrible losses—more than 160,000 dead. Once he believed that his Government, good or bad, would be free of foreign interference. Now he's convinced that his Government—whatever assortment of generals happens to be in power at the moment—is a puppet of the Pentagon. And every time a big American car zips by him on the streets of Saigon; every time he enters a restaurant he can no longer afford; every time he returns to his shabby dwelling (the Americans have grabbed all the best accommodations) he sees himself moving closer and closer to second-class citizenship.

If the foregoing sounds like an anti-American tirade, it's not intentional. There are still hundreds of smart, dedicated, and effective Americans in Vietnam. They want to win this tragic war and, through a firsthand acquaintance with the realities of guerrilla warfare, they think they know how to do it. Unfortunately, they're only fighting the war, not running it. And they're vastly outnumbered and outranked by the desk-pilots in Saigon.

For this reason, the Communists are almost certain to alllhie their way to victory eventually. When they do, it will be a disaster for the West. For all my reservations about life in the Saigon sector of the free world, I'm convinced, after seeing both

1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3485

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500320026-7

aces, that the South Vietnamese are vastly better off than their countrymen to the north.

When I went to Vietnam, I shared the common Canadian view of such faraway places. I half suspected that, for those unfortunate enough to live in such countries, life in the free sector was just about as miserable as life under communism. But a few visits to Hanoi and other Communist centers quickly disabused me of this notion. I'll never forget the people who would pass me on the streets and whisper "A bas les Communistes," or the officials who risked their freedom to tell me privately of their hatred for the regime of Ho Chi Minh. It was a rude contrast with Saigon, where free speech, while not prevalent, is at least still possible.

For all their strategic failings, the Americans are fighting a just war. But they're going to lose it unless they make drastic changes—for at present, the American is his own worst enemy in Vietnam. By his obtuse policies and actions he has squandered the good will of his allies. Without it, he can't win. Without it, there is nothing left to win.

DULUTH, MINN.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I wish to thank you for your courageous efforts and sound thinking about the Vietnam mess.

May your efforts meet with increased and growing support and be ultimately crowned with success. Were it not for voices like yours, one would be inclined to think he were habitating a giant madhouse.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter we are sending to President Johnson and our Senators as well as Vice President HUMPHREY.

Again may we express our appreciation for your outspoken intelligent attitude and further advise you that countless numbers of our friends, neighbors and associates share our views.

Respectfully yours,
GEORGE E. and RHODA L. DIZARD.

RUSCOMA PRODUCTS Co.,
Fleetwood, Po.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: As a free and independent man I urge you to reconsider our present policy in Indochina.

This policy has alienated Cambodia and continues to hurt our image in many otherwise friendly nations. We have given full support to one dictatorship after another in South Vietnam, thereby, probably pushing those people closer to communism.

As a mature nation we are surely capable of altering our policies when necessary without fear of losing prestige.

Very truly yours,
FREDERICK SCHWARTZ,
President.

RUSCOMB PRODUCTS Co.,
Fleetwood, Po.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There have been many occasions in the past years that I have read with admiration, of the positions you have taken on various issues.

I agree with your views concerning U.S. foreign policy in southeast Asia.

You are courageous and I wish there were many more Senators like you.

Very truly yours,
FREDERICK SCHWARTZ,
President.

PIONEER METHODIST CHURCH,
Portland, Oreg.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my support in your attempts to get the war in Vietnam stopped.

Which is more dishonorable? To pull out now without victory? or to wait 3 years and pull out then still without victory?

Sincerely yours,
P. MALCOLM HAMMOND.

RESOLUTION ON SOUTH VIETNAM

"Whereas the conflict in South Vietnam has reached such proportions that it threatens to escalate into a third world war; and

"Whereas it is becoming more apparent daily that the presence of the U.S. forces is an anathema to the citizens of South Vietnam; and

"Whereas the vast sums of money that our country is expending could be put to use in more humane ways in our own country, instead of supporting a group of militarists who do not have the confidence of their own people; and

"Whereas our posture as so-called advisers to South Vietnam has become untenable morally and economically; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the 57th Assembly District Council Issues Conference of the California Democratic Council urge in the best interests of the United States and all parties concerned that our Government find means immediately to negotiate a settlement of this conflict."

Moved, seconded, and passed on February 20, 1965, at said Issues Conference, Encino Community Center, Encino, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are enclosing a copy of two resolutions acted upon by our council. We submit them for and request your thoughtful action.

RICHARD J. HUNTER,
First Vice Chairman, 57th Assembly
District Council, California Democratic
Council.

BINGHAMTON, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you to express my support of your position on Vietnam. Further U.S. military action in this area can lead to a situation where freedom for all peoples and all nations will be at an end, where everything of value will be utterly destroyed.

The United States can do as much as almost any nation in the world to turn away from a course toward war and toward one where meaningful and moral acts are possible. Military action cannot achieve the goals of freedom or self-determination. The choice of the United States may be the most crucial one in history.

Sincerely yours,
ALICE SARDELL.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I agree with your views on Vietnam 100 percent and all this intervention will just bring on a big war.

We've got enough problems here at home without worrying about every country in the world. All we're doing is making enemies by supplying arms and giving our money away.

You're doing a fine job and many people are with you, thank you very much.

Sincerely,
EDWIN J. KOZELUH.

WILLOUGHBY OHIO.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read in the Cleveland Plain Dealer about your speech in City Club Forum. We are proud to say, you are one of our greatest Americans.

Sincerely,
JOSEPH RAY and W.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not one of your constituents, I am taking the liberty to write to you to express my appreciation for the position you are taking concerning our involvement in Vietnam.

One hears the voice of reason and justice in your speeches, and I trust it will reach more and more people in our country. I feel grateful to you for your statesmanlike approach to this problem.

Sincerely yours,
PETER R. PRIFTI.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: You have put up a good, long, honest fight to get our troops out of that Vietnam mess. We hope and pray that God gives you the strength and health to keep on fighting.

Why do we have such fools for leaders?
Yours respectfully,

JACK E. O'DONALD.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Mr. DIRKSEN says "are we going to run away from the Communists?" I might remind him, we have been running from them since the Korean war. We couldn't lick the North Koreans, how we going to defeat Red China?

We averted the big bomb during the Korean war; the Russians didn't explode their first atom bomb until 1952. Then, they had no stockpile in 1950 at the outset of the Korean conflict. Why didn't we explode the atomic bomb against North Korea? We didn't hesitate to use it on the Japs.

Mr. MORSE, we cannot defeat Red China without the use of nuclear weapons. That is very evident. We cannot afford a long, drawn out, jungle war.

We have but two alternatives; viz:
We can furnish Chiang Kai-shek atomic weapons and let him fight his way back to the mainland; or

We can pull out entirely from southeast Asia and wait for Russia and Red China to eventually engage each other in an all-out conflict.

In any case we must not make the tragic mistake of exchanging frontline pawns with Red China.

Yours truly,
MELVIN I. SMITH.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Senators MORSE, McCOE, FULBRIGHT, MANE-FIELD, and GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sirs: I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for whatever you have done in your effort to get someone to listen to the wish of people who really think, to call a halt to this foolish fighting in Vietnam.

The beginning, of course, must be a cease-fire and withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam but to stop there would be pretty negative.

I think there needs to be widespread publicizing of proposals for and actual beginnings on an extensive "TVA" type of development of the Mecong Delta resources for power which could make possible the sort of economic development which would form the basis for the increased human welfare which is the really deep need in this trouble area.

To move forward in this area with aid comparable to that which we are pouring down the drain in military action would—or could—go a long way toward allaying the fears of those who feel that withdrawing our troops might throw wide open the doors to a Communist takeover.

It seems to me that the ones who arrive "the fastest with the mostest" of what will really help the people will render an invaluable service not only to the people of

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500320026-7

February 25

3486
Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500320026-7

Vietnam but to mankind as a whole. For it seems to me that this is the only dependable way to work at stabilizing the situation there and preventing the spreading of hostilities.

Keep up your good work—and expand it in every way possible.

Very truly yours,

MARIE E. ANDERSON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my wholehearted agreement with the views you expressed here on what we should do in South Vietnam—I oppose escalation of the war there. I believe that we should do everything we can possibly do through diplomatic channels to bring about a peaceful settlement in that war-torn and politically unstable country.

I agree with your ideas of exporting economic freedom to underdeveloped countries. I do not believe in giving military aid to countries which can then use this military aid against us and those we support. Look at what Sukarno is up to now.

Thanks for coming to Cleveland and expressing your views. They need to be heard.

Yours truly,

KATHERYN S. WEITZEL.

McMINNVILLE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend you on your forthright stand concerning Vietnam. Any expansion of the war would be suicidal—and I only hope that it is not too late to negotiate honorably.

While I often disagree with you, I admire your courage and honesty. On this problem, I am 100 percent with you.

Sincerely yours,

CARLE H. MALBUR.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you to tell you that many people around the country are grateful to you for your efforts to prevent America getting involved in a world war in Asia. We hope that you will keep it up, so that all will know that the American people are not ready to rubberstamp an escalation. We hope that you will continue to attack the policy of retaliation in the North.

There follows a short poem in honor of the present confusion:

"Big Minh, Khanh, and Little Minh,
When one is out, the other's in.
Who's in charge? We do not know,
He surely stands for freedom though.
And if we risk a world war,
It's certainly worth dying for."

Sincerely yours,

DAVID B. BARRON, M.D.

BERKLEY, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We strongly support your position of favoring negotiations on the question of South Vietnam.

Yours truly,

Prof. and Mrs. HERBERT STRAUSS.

CARMEL, CALIF.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I certainly agree with you about a cease fire and negotiate a peace in Vietnam and get out of there. We cannot police the world. The U.N., instead of recessing, should have stayed in session and have done something about the mess out there. I heard you and the Senator from

Alaska speak about getting out of Vietnam, over a year ago.

Best regards to you.

EMILY L. TURNER.

St. LOUIS, MO.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Have you seen the article in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (December 1964), which outlines the remarkable work which many countries are joining in to develop the lower Mekong Valley?

It describes a more humanitarian solution to Vietnam than the course we are pursuing. You are no doubt familiar with the subject matter of the article, but it does set it out in complete form.

Why can't we support this instead of shooting each other?

Sincerely,

MARIE BLISS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your brilliant views on the Vietnam crisis. I feel very strongly for a settlement and withdrawal. I sincerely hope you continue your strong stand concerning this vital situation.

Thank you very much,

JEFFREY BERLINER.

PORTLAND, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator:

It is hard to believe that the United States deliberately is trying to settle a dispute by force outside the United Nations. The United Nations was created to avoid future wars, to negotiate differences. All countries should take part in this matter. In order to be effective for disarmament, an army consisting of members of all countries should be the only body to have the right to police and watch that nobody is able to arm secretly.

Sincerely,

E. MERKL.

LEBANON, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We implore you to use all the influence you have to stop this foolhardy mission in Vietnam.

We worked hard for Johnson before election, but feel that he has betrayed the hopes and trust of Democrats and Republicans alike.

We are not concerned with "loss of face." (Leave that to the orientals.) We are concerned with peace in the United States. Martin Luther King made more sense in his TV message to his people on nonviolence, than any of the soothing syrup that has come out of Washington. This is an insult to any American who can read. We can see the flag-draped coffins of our men, who died needlessly.

Before we set out to show another country how to run their government, let us repair our own. For this purpose, Americans will more gladly give their hard earned tax money. We need our money here at home to take care of our old people. We need it for education. We need it for the protection of our citizens from criminals.

I wish I could say all these things to President Johnson, but I would have to have a fairy godmother to make that possible.

I am a Democrat. I am an American. I hope that some day I can say that proudly again, and in any country I might be in. Today, I would be afraid to travel, because we are hated and scorned.

May God grant you power and health,
WAYNE MORSE. You have not let us down.
Very sincerely,

WINNIE THOMPSON.

ELMA, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Enclosed with this letter is a copy of a letter we have addressed to Senator KENNEDY of New York, also to Representative RICHARD MCCARTHY of the 39th Congressional District, New York.

We fully endorse the stand you take in the Senate in relation to our activities in southeast Asia and we believe you will be interested to know that there are some people like us who share your views and who sympathize with the victims of the U.S. militarists and their allies. We reject completely all military activities. They are vicious, cruel, and stupid and entirely unfit for human beings to engage in.

Respectfully yours,

R. W. and G. H. BAUM.

ELMA, N.Y.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and
Representative MCCARTHY:

The writers of this letter wish to express their feeling of horror concerning the vicious activities of the U.S. military machine on the rampage in southeast Asia. Are these really the acts of human beings? Is Congress really so helpless in the wake of all of this vicious brutality? Is Congress a mere rubber stamp for the Pentagon and its allies?

Won't you do your part to put an end to this disgraceful performance, demanding that U.S. forces be brought home where they belong? The people of southeast Asia must be permitted to settle their affairs peacefully, which they would have done years ago if they had been permitted to do so.

Mr. Eisenhower, when President, addressing a Governor's Conference on August 4, 1958, had this to say:

"Now let us assume that we lost Indochina . . . the tin and tungsten that we so greatly value from that area would cease coming."

"So when the United States votes \$400 million to help that war, we are not voting a give away program. We are voting for the cheapest way that we can prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the United States."

And to obtain cheap tin and tungsten and more on our own terms we have become the world's most loathsome people. Hiroshima is not forgotten.

R. W. and G. H. BAUM.

We, the undersigned, wish to state our firm opposition to the continuation of current U.S. policy in Vietnam. Our reasons are various and individual, but we are together in calling for an immediate cessation of American military activities in Vietnam, in calling for the U.S. Government to seek actively a negotiated settlement, and in supporting Senators MORSE, GAVENING, McCLOY, CHURCH, and other public officials who have dared to challenge the administration's orthodoxy and who have called for a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

We also call upon Senator FULBRIGHT and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to conduct thorough and public hearings on the Vietnam policy of the United States in order that the American people may know exactly what their Government has been doing there and why.

James D. Hunt, Evert Makinen, Bert Fowler, Robert Linn, Carl Beal, David Borthwick, Byron Fox, Harvey Bates, Vernon Biefer, Morris Barker, Bill Eekhouse, Sandra Ann Dryers, Jill Ferguson, Judy Labeu, John A. Strong, A. Achanya, Joao Webba, David Wiesner, Patrick Brumzawcehrldge, Alfred D. Bredber, and Anbin Pesko.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500320026-7

1965

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500320026-7

3487

SYRACUSE, N.Y., February 22, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am forwarding the enclosed petitions to you on behalf of their signers who are students and faculty members of Syracuse University and/or residents of Syracuse, N.Y.

As the petition says, the reasons of the signers are various and individual. My own reasons are twofold. As a Catholic, I feel conscience-bound to oppose your current policy in Vietnam as basically unjust and immoral. I can find no moral justification for it, not even within the provisions of the Catholic Church's doctrine of "just war," a more permissive standard, perhaps, than the strictures of the gospel. I can cooperate in no way with you in this crime. Nor can I say that I am proud to be a member of the Great Society that engages in such misadventures.

My second reason for objecting to your policy is based on my analysis of the Vietnam situation as a student of political science. Along this line, suffice it to say that I am in essential agreement with Senator WAYNE MOSE.

I hope that the beclouded picture one gets of your Vietnam policy in the press is only a function of your wariness of public opinion. If so, perhaps this letter and petition will help you to see your way clear to a different course of action.

Until such time, I remain in sincere and complete opposition to you on this topic.

Very truly yours,

EVERT MAKINEN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter and petition that I have sent to the President. A copy has also been sent to Senator FULBRIGHT.

Together with the others who signed the petition, I am hoping that this small action on our part will provide support for your efforts and encourage you and Senators CHURCH, MCGOVERN, GRUENING, and others to continue in your efforts to change the course of the administration's policy.

My wife and I were very happy to hear you speak on the Syracuse University campus recently. I wonder if it would be possible for you to send us a copy of that speech, together with a copy of the remarks you have printed on pages 242-253 of the 1965 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6.

Sincerely,

EVERT MAKINEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I firmly applaud your stand in favor of a negotiated settlement of the situation in Vietnam through peaceful means.

Your actions are much, greatly appreciated, and lend hope and inspiration to an otherwise cloudy picture.

Please continue your efforts; you are right.

Yours,

J. SULLIVAN.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank the good Lord we have a courageous man like you, who is not afraid of being a loud and clear opposition and who raises his voice in defense of truth and sanity.

We need to hear your point of view more often.

How can we bring your ideas to the people more often so they can see for themselves that there is another point of view?

The trend of the times since Roosevelt's day seems to me to have been defined in one single easy conclusion. We're the good guy in the story, and Moscow is the bad guy, or China, and that is all there is to it.

No. 37—8

But the turmoil of our world is much more complex when so many millions of peoples are involved, in tiny nations as well as great ones; therefore, I feel the problems which confront the world will not necessarily be solved by our way, nor will force bring our way about any sooner. Why can't we have a newscast from our Government in which all sides of a picture are freely discussed?

Whether we live or die in atomic war is too grave a question to leave to our leaders. If we are going to chance annihilation, we, too, should have a clear view about that which we give up all humanity for.

Why shouldn't we help decide?

What I and many of your admirers would like is to hear from you more often (and men like you). Only truth on all sides and logic can keep us free and safe.

Thank you for fighting always for the right as you see it.

We wish there were many more peoples' representatives like yourself.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAULINE DICKSON.

FARMINGTON, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have just sent the following telegram to the President:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our hearts cry out for peace. We beg you to lead the American people and the world away from the abyss of escalating war in Vietnam. Friendly nations, the United Nations, leaders of worldwide stature have offered their services to help us overcome the obstacles to peace. We beg you to hear the world's longing in this crucial hour and to lead us into the ways of peace."

We appreciate very much and are grateful to you that you have raised your voice on this issue, and used your influence to prevent precipitate action. We would like you to know our support for this.

Respectfully yours,

FOR THE SOCIETY OF
BROTHERS:

ARTHUR WISER,
JOHN WINTER,
DONALD NOBLE,
ANDREAS MEIER,
MICHAEL BRANDES,
JOHANN C. ARNOLD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo for your courageous stand on the Vietnam fiasco. It is through voices like yours that the truth will finally seep through to the public. If we can't get the United States to recognize its illegality, perhaps whoever is running this show, will get around to negotiate rather than retaliate. Instead of bombing to show the strength which the whole world knows we have, we can show our strength of character by a unilateral cease-fire. This should bring many more benefits to us in the world, than any display of our well-known military capacities.

Sincerely,

PHILIP BRANDSTEIN.

DULUTH, Minn.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, United States of America,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are extremely concerned about the situation in Vietnam. Long articles, not to mention books, have been written on the subject. We do not intend, herein, to develop involved points of view and further we recognize that this is not a simple situation.

We do however want to make a few obvious observations:

1. We live in a nuclear age. It is difficult for the average human mind to grasp fully the implications of this. The magnitude of the destructive possibilities should not escape the grasp of those in positions of leadership who are in effect the custodians of the results of thousands of years of slow and painful development of the human race.

2. Vietnam is in the backyard of China. This is not said to excuse any abuse of the responsibility of elementary neighborliness by any nation anywhere, except to pose the question this way:

What would our reaction be if some other nation was engaged in military action in Mexico or Canada?

Would such actions be inclined to encourage friendly attitudes and potential relations of suspicion and hatred?

3. What evidence do we have of the desire of the South Vietnamese for the kind of protection we are giving them? This last question directed to the chaotic game of "musical chairs" currently played by the various in and out factions vying for power in South Vietnam.

We feel strongly about this situation. Our friends and neighbors and associates generally are expressing a growing uneasiness over this situation.

We urge that our Government respond to the suggestions of numerous governments, the U.N. Secretary General, the Pope, and various other organizations and individuals and agree to participate in a broad conference of all interested parties seeking to find a peaceful settlement for this war weary people and an ultimate disengagement of our Armed Forces.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE E. and RHODA L. DIZARD.

Copies to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President; Hon. EUGENE MC-CARTHY, U.S. Senator; Hon. WALTER F. MON-DALE, U.S. Senator.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,
Norman, Okla.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courageous stand on the South Vietnam war will be remembered by those of us who wince every time our Government issues an official statement on that war as a welcome voice allaying our frustrations caused by lack of a forum. Your thorough article that appeared some time ago in the New York Times Sunday magazine I found irrefutable.

My wife and I, both, are native Oregonians. We are proud to claim you as a Senator from our home State. We enjoy the arguments that our esteem for you gets us into.

If it is possible, we would appreciate any materials that you could send on the Vietnam war so that we may better enlighten our friends of "the other view."

Very truly yours,

HERBERT W. TITUS,
Assistant Professor of Law, University of
Oklahoma.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue your present course on Vietnam.

Your course and that of Senator GRUENING have set the pace and, with recent recruits to your side, can well turn the tide.

Please do not falter.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT MELTON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, next week I hope to have finished a speech that I am now preparing in answer to others that have been given in the Senate in recent days by my colleagues who

want to continue America's aggressive policies in Asia. The advocates of a war-hawk approach in our course of action in southeast Asia ought to ponder for a long time the statement issued yesterday by Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant. That is particularly true for those in the Senate who are trying to cover over the fact that there is a civil war going on in southeast Asia.

One of the most remarkable announcements of recent days was that this is not a civil war at all. Mr. President, it is completely a civil war, plus the aggressive course of action of the United States participating where it has no business or right to be.

Mr. U Thant made it perfectly clear yesterday that it was a civil war. One of the saddest hours is the hour in which we find the administration of our Government releasing statements to the press to the effect that it is not interested in negotiating a peace.

I say with sadness in my heart that, in my judgment, the United States of America is the greatest threat to the peace of the world in this dark hour. We are the greatest threat to the peace of the world because of the illegal war that we are fighting in southeast Asia quite openly and blatantly, with American jet planes dropping bombs on North Vietnam. These planes are completely manned by American military personnel. This is being done without a declaration of war.

Let me say to the war hawks in the Senate and House of Representatives, "You ought to bring in a declaration of war, if you really want to support a war in southeast Asia."

I shall continue to pray that reason and sense will come to pervade the leaders in the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House so that America will stop its shocking outlawry. If we continue this course of action—and let someone in the Senate deny it on the basis of the briefings we have heard in recent days—we are bound to provoke Red China into committing an overt act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYNES in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I be permitted to speak for 1 additional minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that will give the war hawks of the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House an excuse, but not a reason, to bomb the Chinese nuclear installation—which I am satisfied is their objective and has been their objective for some time.

When that installation is bombed, the big show will be on. Let no one deny that it would require sending to Asia immediately no less than 300,000 American boys who would start meeting Chinese ground forces that would be poured in, to the number of several million—300,000 American soldiers would be but a start in the sacrifice that the United States would have to make in the event of an all-out war on the ground in Asia, which we can never win, I care

not how many American divisions we pour into Asia. We would bog this country down for 25 or 50 years, and drain it dry in material and blood, until some candidate for President runs on a platform of "I will go to Vietnam" and negotiate a settlement.

This is a critical hour in the history of our Republic. My voice will continue to be raised in opposition to my Government's warmaking policies in Asia, short of a declaration of war. Present that declaration of war, vote it through Congress; and, on the basis of the present facts, I shall vote against it. But once we vote for a declaration of war, I shall urge that we unite behind that declaration until we can somehow, in some way, put that war behind us. But that war, plus our present outlawry in southeast Asia, does not have a scintilla of justification to support it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe that I reflect the views of the American people when I say that we are a peace-loving country.

We joined the United Nations because we believe in peace. We seek no aggrandizement. We desire no colonies. We have the responsibility of leadership, as I see it, in the cause of peace with justice around this unhappy globe.

The senior Senator from Oregon is my friend. But the Senator from Oregon is completely in error in the comments which he has just made.

I suggest that, 10 years after the President of the United States saw fit to respond to a call for assistance by the people in the Government of South Vietnam, it is far too late to argue whether we should have taken that position at that time.

Let me recall that only a year ago Congress overwhelmingly adopted a resolution clothing the President with complete authority to utilize the might and power of the people of the United States with respect to the commitment that this country, in 1954, had made. Representatives of the Senate and the House of Representatives overwhelmingly gave that kind of authority to the President.

An agreement was reached in 1954. The major nations of the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, participated in that agreement. That agreement was that there would be no further marauding from north of the 17th parallel to the south.

I agree with the President. This sad conflict can be terminated immediately if the Communists abide by the agreement which was entered into in 1954. In the meanwhile, as an American citizen, I support the President of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take 3 minutes to reply to the Senator from California.

I completely disagree with the premises laid down. In the first place, the United States started immediately to violate the same agreement that the Senator from California is talking about. We did not negotiate the agreement. We did not even sign the agreement. The neutral commission that was set up has found us to be in violation of it.

Why do people who continue to advocate the outlawry in South Vietnam not tell the American people the facts about our violation of that agreement? The Secretary General of the United Nations knows those facts and it may be that Americans will have to learn from him what our own Government will not tell us.

The Senator from California repeats the argument that we made a commitment in South Vietnam. Whether we set up that puppet government in 1954 or not, that is our puppet today. That fact does not give us any right to make war in South Vietnam.

The Senator spoke about the United Nations. No nation is as guilty of scuttling the United Nations at the present time as is the United States, as a result of the conduct of our United Nations Ambassador in the latest session. To think that our Ambassador would stand up and try to tell the American people that we voted only on a matter of procedure the other day. The United Nations voted. Mr. President, are you surprised to hear the spokesman for Red China say, as announced in the press, that the United States has lost its case in the United Nations because of the surrender we made on the vote the other day? The sad fact is—I am sorry it must be admitted—that he is correct. The United States has much to answer for in the shocking position it took which resulted in the weakening of article 19 of the United Nations Charter. We should have held Russia's and France's noses to the grindstone. A better figure of speech would be that we should have held them to the rule of law. We have let France and Russia get away with defying the charter of the United Nations.

I repeat now, by reference, every word I said to which the Senator from California attempted to reply. Now is the time for the United States to make clear to the world that we are willing to negotiate honorably, but only honorably, for an honest settlement in Asia. Let me say to the Senator from California that if we continue this action we are going to get the world in an unnecessary war.

The argument that we have given power to the President to act overlooks the fact that we do not have the constitutional authority to delegate our power under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

I shall always be glad to have my descendants read that I voted against the resolution to which the Senator referred. The resolution cannot give the President legal power to make war. Congress ought to adopt another resolution, a declaration of war, if that is what Congress wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the text of the Indochina joint resolution passed at the previous Congress.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the prin-